

E629

READINGS IN SOCIOLOGY

VOL. III

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

EDITED BY

KISABURO KAWABE, M.A., PH.D.

THE HOKUSEIDO PRESS

PREFACE

Nothing has been so recklessly abused and so grossly misunderstood as the term *Social Science*, as it is taken now in our country. It seems as though many people look on this term as synonymous with the *most radical socialism*, with which, however, it has no kinship whatever except in the linguistic genealogy of "Social."

Social Science means nothing but the technique of the scientific study of social phenomena, or the scientific investigation of human social life; hence law, politics, economics, history, anthropology, ethnology, psychology, sociology, comparative philology, and anthropo-geography—these are its typical categories.

This series of readings is intended primarily for the use of the English classes in higher schools, but due care has been exercised to present in a harmonious unity only those materials that may be suitably adopted from well-recognized authorities in the respective fields. Thus it is hoped that it may serve, at the same time, for the use of the classes in sociology and other branches of social science in the study of original English materials.

To make the books readable as well as logically consistent, selections have been made from a large number of authorities—books and periodicals—, and

put together, sometimes partly rewritten, in such a manner that the same chapters and even the same sections frequently consist of materials from several different sources. For this reason, the editor has preferred not to indicate the sources in detail.

In the present volume the writer has endeavored, as far as the space would permit, to show the principal social problems of our times, as interpreted in the light of the most advanced contemporary theory and practice, and he hopes this may serve as a guide to the further study of human social life. The main source-materials included or referred to in this volume are Ford's "Social Problems and Social Policy," Parmelee's "Poverty and Social Progress" and "Criminology," Garofalo's "Criminology," Healey's "The Individual Delinquent," Flexner's "Prostitution in Europe," Galbraith's "The Family and the New Democracy," Popenoe's "Applied Eugenics," and Groves's "Social Problems and Education."

KISABURO KAWABE.

MATSUE KOTO-GAKKO.

March, 1927.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I.	SOCIAL UNREST	I
1.	Our Social Unrest.								
2.	The Meaning of Social Unrest.								
3.	Material Progress not Social Progress.								
4.	The Social Task of Science.								
5.	Pathological Restlessness.								
6.	Pathological Conservatism.								
7.	Restlessness due to Inhibition								
8.	Education and Social Unrest.								
II.	PROBLEM OF POVERTY	22
1.	Socialistic Theory of Poverty.								
2.	Waste Theory and Other Unilateral Theories.								
3.	Organic and Evolutionary Theories of Poverty.								
4.	Conditions of Poverty								
5.	Poverty and Degeneration.								
III.	DEPENDENTS AND DEFECTIVES	37
1.	Dependent Children.								
2.	The Aged Poor.								
3.	The Unemployed.								
4.	Mendicants and Vagrants.								
5.	The Defectives and the Destitute Sick.								
IV.	CRIME AND SOCIAL CONTROL	56
1.	The Conflict Between Individual and Social Interests.								
2.	The Characteristic Features and Definition of Crime.								
3.	Crime Created by Religious, Despotic, and Class Legislation								
4.	Vicious Acts Stigmatized as Criminal.								
5.	The Defective Traits of the Criminal Class.								

6.	Crime and Social Changes.	
7.	The Prevention of Crime Dependent Upon the Prevention of Other Social Evils.	
8.	The Normal Life as a Preventive of Crime.	
V.	PROSTITUTION	78
1.	Definition and the Scope of the Term.	
2.	Objections to Prostitution.	
3.	Irregular Sex Connections.	
4.	Economic loss Caused by Prostitution.	
5.	Economic Cause of Prostitution.	
6.	The Biologic Factor of Prostitution.	
7.	Man's Physiological Necessity.	
8.	The Civilization Value of Prostitution.	
9.	Masculine Unchastity and the Double Standard of Morals	
VI.	VENEREAL DISEASES	99
1.	Gonorrhoea.	
2.	Syphilis.	
3.	Syphilis and Marriage.	
4.	Syphilis and Engagements to Marry.	
5.	Syphilis and Prostitution.	
6.	Syphilis and Divorce.	
7.	Public Efforts Against the Venereal Diseases	
VII.	EUGENICS	113
1.	Negative Eugenics.	
2.	Positive Eugenics.	
3.	Criticisms of Proposed Eugenic Measures.	
4.	Eugenics and the Theory of Population.	
5.	Eugenic Measures and the Prevention of Poverty.	
VIII.	PREVENTION OF POVERTY	128
1.	Summary of Remedial Measures.	
2.	Social Legislation.	
3.	The Utility of Social Legislation.	
4.	A National Minimum.	
5.	Preventive Measures.	

IX. INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY 143

1. Nature and Purpose of Democracy
2. Partnership of Capital and Labor.
3. The Trade Union Movement.
4. Collective Bargaining.
5. Political Activities of Trade Unions.
6. Criticisms of Trade Unionism.
7. Results from Trade Unionism.
8. Governmental Ownership of Public Utilities.
9. The Outlook for Industrial Democracy.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL UNREST

§ 1.—OUR SOCIAL UNREST.

No one who places his finger on the pulsations of present-day social experiences questions the existence of widespread social unrest. We are living in an age socially as discontented and feverishly restless as the world has ever known. The discontent is not, however, a hidden dissatisfaction, far under the surface and known only by the few gifted in genius for penetrating into contemporary conditions. Our social discontent is self-conscious, boastful and even blatant. It is also omnipresent and from it we can not escape. It has entered into the remote countryside and brought under its spell even the least sensitive of farm "help." It has captured the house servant and brought chaos to individualistic housekeeping and crowded the hotels with those who would escape the responsibilities of homekeeping. Contrary to the opinion of some, it is not class movement, for it cuts across classes and is found among the wealthy just as it is among the poor. It is not in any sense

national, for it has swept the entire temperate zone like a rapid-moving fire.

§ 2.—THE MEANING OF SOCIAL UNREST.

If we ask whether this unrest is justified by the conditions of social life, we are at once plunged into violent controversy. Alfred Russel Wallace, co-discoverer of evolution with Charles Darwin, denounced our social régime in these bitter words: "It is not too much to say that our whole system of society is rotten from top to bottom, and the Social Environment as a whole, in relation to our possibilities and our claims, is the worst that the world has ever seen." Even if we attempt to discount this indictment as a product of old age, we have to admit in fairness that it was the logical culmination of opinions held in earlier life by one of the world's greatest scientists. Notwithstanding the lamentations of many that this is a degenerate age, when faced with the facts every one must admit that during the past fifty years there has been an immense improvement in the ethical standards of society. The political spell-binder has lost his grip; politics have in some measure been purified; official corruption has diminished; the standards of efficiency of our public officials have been raised; for the first time in our history the application of ethical principles to business affairs has made a little headway; we are beginning to question the perfection of our legal procedure; a new sense of civic responsibility and of our duty to our fellow

men has been created, and we are acquiring new and higher ideals of patriotism and of international relations.

It is obviously difficult to compare our present social restlessness with that of preceding periods. It is clear, however, that in our time such restlessness as people feel is openly and easily expressed. Society abounds in mediums by means of which discontent can find voice; the newspaper, literature, forum, lecture platform and especially organization provide opportunity for agitation and propaganda. Discontent certainly was never before so freely made known, and this publicity tends to multiply it, for discontent is in part a product of suggestion.

Although widespread social unrest constitutes a social problem for any period the discontent must not be interpreted as inherently evil. It represents a challenge to the social conditions which called it forth, but it may be due to the advancing intelligence which has become intolerant of the slow progress of social standards and practices. On the other hand social unrest may spring from a nervously unstable leadership and may represent an easy escape for a multitude who are unwilling to accept the social consequences of their inefficient habits or lack of industry or ambition. Whatever the cause of social unrest it necessarily involves risk since it represents a social force that can easily be turned into mere destruction.

§ 3.— MATERIAL PROGRESS NOT SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Material advancement provides means for social progress; it is not itself progress. The means must not be confused with the end. The production of great quantities of material resources establishes a basis for higher standards and more efficient social adjustment but it does not by itself issue in greater social well-being.

When the industrial revolution began to reveal the menacing changes it brought about among the factory workers it was pleasantly assumed by those financially interested in factory development that merely by cheapening the process of making things all classes would be socially enriched. That was a foolish assumption. To hold it now is stupid stubbornness of mind. There are some who by heroic effort still cling to it, fearing that nothing else can give a substantial basis for the idea of progress. It is, however, growing more and more difficult for any one to believe that social security will necessarily follow from the contributions of science that enrich the material resources. This unpalatable but enormously significant fact can only be held out of consciousness by those persons who are willing to cloud social truths if for a season they may protect their intellectual comfort from such disquieting disenchantment as would follow the admission that unrest has become the dominant social phenomenon in this age of scientific prosperity. It is becoming increasingly

difficult, however, for any one to shut his eyes to the premonitory fact that stands out so clearly. A multitude of men and women are by no means socially content in this era of science ; they are profoundly dissatisfied and their souls are seething with restlessness. The solid fact can not be pushed aside by refusal to recognize it.

§ 4—THE SOCIAL TASK OF SCIENCE.

From a social point of view science has not been as successful as the average scientist imagines. Science means more than a mere collecting of information. It is not simply a classifying in a systematic way of all the trustworthy facts known at the time. It is especially an attitude of mind and one that human nature acquires with painful difficulty. It originates, to be sure, from a universal instinct of curiosity, but the finished product contains an element of personal indifference which is foreign to the unmodified instinct. Science is the highest form of that reality thinking of which the psychoanalysts¹ make so much, and stands in sharpest contrast with their definition of the easy-going pleasure-form of thought. It is the most heroic effort the human mind can make to get rid of all personal inclination and bias in meeting

¹ One who diagnoses and treats mental and nervous disorders by careful analysis of the emotional history of the patient. This method is called psycho-analysis and was originated by Dr. Sigmund Freud, and modified by Jung and Adler. They ascribe such disorders to some sort of suppressed emotions caused by inhibitions.

an intellectual problem in order that the truth of any matter may be as accurately known as is possible. It is in its success in putting aside personal desire that scientific thinking distinguishes itself and wins the right of intellectual supremacy. Huxley has most happily expressed this spirit of self-renunciation on the part of the scientist when he faces any investigation :

“Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the great truth which is embodied in the Christian conception of active surrender to the will of God. Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up any preconceived notion, follow humbly wherein and to whatever abysses nature leads or you shall learn nothing.”

Unscientific thinking is under no such coercive discipline, but may, if it pleases, follow hard after personal desire even though at the end it be ditched from having neglected fact for fancy.

Science has, by its superior attitude of mind, accomplished marvels and obtained a spectacular success. It has not, however, given the great mass of people any appreciation of its highest function. Science has been valued by the majority of people for its accomplishments, not for its portrayal of the advantages of stern discipline in mental experience. It has merely encouraged a vast multitude to believe that human existence is a never-ending pleasure hunt and science the best giver of material comforts and luxuries. The

craving for personal gratification has been stimulated by the magic-like productions of science until an appetite has been created that nothing can satisfy. Social well-being has needed the teaching of science more than its products. The philosophy of the street admires science for its liberality in things ; it turns with indifference from any attempt to popularize the self-restraining spirit of science. The scientist is welcomed as a good workman ; he is ignored as a teacher. As Giddings has so well said :

“ Science makes its way with the multitude, not because the multitude is capable of understanding it, or even of greatly caring about it, but chiefly because the multitude sees that science does things. It safeguards the crops. It prevents or controls epidemics. It cuts down freight rates, and it transmits thought through pathless wastes of firmament and sea.”

From such a situation social sanity can not be expected. Science increases the power and freedom of men ; it fails, or thus far has failed, to prepare them for the proper use of their increasing opportunities. The race with its more than a hundred thousand years of stern discipline and struggle is hardly ready for the present enormous quantity of pleasures and the life-motives that are constructed in pleasure-terms. The social problem has come to be merely making life easier for a greater number of people and by some process permitting material pleasures to be equally shared.

Even if we assume that this program states the goal of all social endeavor it by no means follows that its working out is a simple matter. The problem of method still remains and here, if ever, there is need of patient scientific investigation and experimentation. Social experience ought by this time to have taught men how complicated the details of any such program must be and how foolish it is to attempt a quick and *à priori* solution. Why is it, one may well ask, that the popular thought is so intolerant of giving to science the problem of finding a more just distribution of material wealth? The world-wide drift of population toward the cities is part explanation of the confident social philosophy that can not endure the thought of giving even so delicate and hazardous a problem over to "cold-minded" science.

Urban life does not tend to teach men caution in the working out of social programs, for it is difficult in the city to have that first-hand contact with nature, which, more than any other human experience, provides the basis for moral discipline and curbs the arrogant and unreasonable demands of men and women. The city, by hiding the natural obstacles that always hamper the accomplishment of man's purposes and by turning the attention to the competition one person has with another, encourages the belief that the difficulty of obtaining one's complete happiness is due to the interferences of other people. The constant experiences of rural people with the

menace of frosts, blights, insect pests and droughts impress upon them the elemental fact that nature itself is often in opposition to the purposes of men. Rural philosophy becomes naturally suspicious of any get-rich-quick social scheme.

City conditions provide the perfect opportunity for the gregarious leader, who wins his power by skill in directing urban discontent and industrial restlessness. He is by temperament unsympathetic toward the cautious experimental methods of science. Indeed he could not hold his following by a judicial attitude toward social grievances, for they join him not for his accomplishments, but for his ability to voice in catching phrases their inarticulate discontent. Everything in the city conspires to turn this dissatisfaction into economic form. The conflict of classes, the apparent omnipotence of money to furnish the conditions of health, social standing and happiness to the well-to-do of the city and to deny them to the poor, the constant pressure of economic competition, these influences and many others of similar character all tend to magnify the value of money and to conceal the ever-present checks upon human purposes that nature will present under any form of social régime. The urban problem of life boils down to the getting of sufficient money to satisfy one's desires and it becomes the conviction of a multitude that their satisfactions can be increased only by placing limitations upon other people whose desires collide with their own.

Since the modern city is the creation of science, science must assume responsibility for the intense gregarious appeal the city is now making throughout the civilized world. No person, however great his indifference toward science, ever visits our greatest city without appreciating how science makes possible such a modern metropolis. The very existence of the city is conditioned by the inventions that face the visitor on every hand. Were any of the more important contributions science has made to the city's welfare to be removed or made inactive, in an hour's time the city would change from a place of business and amusement to a horrible death trap from which men, women and children would flee as from the clutches of a devouring monster.

§ 5.—PATHOLOGICAL RESTLESSNESS.

A part of our present restlessness is pathological in character. It is based upon nervous instability. A large part of present-day radicalism, whether it expresses itself in economic agitation or denunciation of the conventions of our social life, is due to personal maladjustment. The radical is seldom happy. He considers himself badly treated. He wants changes because he hopes in some way to find the happiness which he so sadly lacks. He is not often willing to recognize that his chief problem is with himself, that he can adjust himself only to fictitious, fanciful and distant circumstances. If he were thrown into a society such as he desires he

would quickly find himself disillusioned and as unhappy as ever, for in whatever society or social order he might go he would have to drag himself along, and the result would be that he would soon be worse than ever because disappointment would be added to his original grievances.

Many radicals are suffering from what the scientist calls *inferiority complex*.¹ They are particularly upset by any subordination they have to endure; they can not bear the thought of being second to anyone, and at the same time they lack the courage to meet their associates in free competition. If in order to earn a living they are forced to submit themselves to the necessary discipline of some business organization, they chafe inwardly and avoid facing their own chronic feeling of inferiority by taking their spite out on the social régime represented by the business which assigns them to a position of subordination.

It is a human impulse to try to reform others when one is dissatisfied with oneself. The radical is our best example of the attempt to get rid of unhappiness by agitating social changes. It is in

1. "*Complex*" is one of the most useful terms of psycho-analytic phraseology. It means a system of connected ideas, with a strong emotional tone, and a tendency to produce actions of a certain definite character. Complex may be of all sorts and kinds, the component ideas may be of every variety, the accompanying emotional tones pleasant or painful, very intense or comparatively weak. "*Inferiority Complex*" is the complex in which the idea of one's own inferiority is the dominant force of the mental contents.

his personal life that the radical is most restless and as a rule his discontent is chiefly tied up with his family situation. In some way he has failed in his own home life. Sometimes it is childhood experience that is at fault: often overbearing parents crushed out the childish attempts at self-expression, or the child may have been marred by the opposite policy, father and mother were so unreasonably indulgent that when the child began to feel the pinching limitations of ordinary competitive life he at once rebelled. Perhaps the trouble that has pushed its victim into radicalism has to do with more recent family difficulty. The most common causes of deep unhappiness connected with family life in the adult period are: not having any family at all, or being unhappily married.

In any case social reformation becomes an antidote for the pressing vexations of the family situation. It is much easier and very much pleasanter to fix the attention upon far away social schemes than to meet the real difficulty face to face and try to solve an actual problem. Down at the bottom of their own life those persons who are on the way to becoming radicals feel a void which nothing fills. They run away from their uncomfortable circumstances by becoming interested in an imaginary outside life which stands in contrast with their personal experience.

Having found the road that could lead them to the solution of their problem, they travel half way

and then lose courage. They do not hopelessly shut themselves within the narrow confines of their own daydreams ; neither do they go out bravely to tussle with reality. They get out of themselves, but they fall into an imaginary world in which they can atone for their dissatisfactions by attacking the things that are and imagining whatever pleases them, however impractical. They agitate to forget their own troubles.

Radicalism thus becomes an abortive effort at personal adjustment. The radical who fails in dealing with his own personal problem never fails with the more difficult and complex social problem : he is never wrong because he is never tested ; he revels in his fancies, free from all the checkmates that come to the person who tries to meet real situations.

A milder type of radical is one who reacts merely against early poverty or family disgrace. Not having been hit so hard by the experiences of his childhood, he feels less bitterness of inferiority. He carries into life, however, no matter how successful he becomes, a grudge ; and enjoys fighting people and things that remind him of his early social handicap.

It is evident that nothing takes the vim out of the radical so quickly as happy marriage and satisfying parenthood. It is no wonder that radicalism usually attacks most fiercely the family, for the family is its greatest destroyer. Wholesome family life brings the agitator who plays freely and irresponsibly with

the creations of his own imagery back to the concrete test of dealing with actual facts. In this way the family teaches practicability and soon the radical attitude is swept aside by the development of a sense of responsibility.

§ 6.— PATHOLOGICAL CONSERVATISM.

If personal inability to adjust oneself to the actual conditions of life leads some people to radicalism it is equally true that this same failure to meet successfully the tests of environment turns others to conservatism. Far away from each other as radicalism and conservatism are, they often spring from the very same defect. They each may represent an unwillingness to face life squarely and cope with its difficulties.

The pathological conservative is struggling with the effort to escape fear and to find an authority upon which he can lean. The new seems dangerous because of a personal unfitness to deal with novel and unexpected circumstances. Whatever has been seems safe and promising, however unadjusted to the immediate present it may have become. These conservatives frequently find themselves in trouble or danger because they get in a position where they try to block progress and are sooner or later pushed aside. They have been clearly defined as people who believe that "nothing should ever be done for the first time." Constantly under the spell of inner fear they are always ready to join with those who

for selfish or sentimental reasons attempt to hold in check some tendency toward more wholesome social life.

The morbidly conservative personality is especially keen upon establishing some new don't or protecting one that has been demonstrated by neutral social experiment as lacking justification. The folly of this negative attitude toward life is well described by Stewart Paton in the following words: "Numerous lives are wrecked by such inhibitions interfering with the constructive, creative forms of mental activity that are necessary to healthy, sane growth, and stability. Doing something reasonable or commendable is much more to be desired than mere passivity in *not* committing an error or crime. A large and unfortunate growing class of psycho-neurotics¹ are obsessed with a desire to placard the world with 'don'ts.' Many lives may be made profitable and happy, not so much by supplying new or different forms of stimulation as by removing such wrongly timed inhibitions. The sublime faith we have in the efficacy of inhibitions is one of the greatest dangers to our civilization. We hope to save and be saved by 'don'ts.' This is both an unfortunate and dangerous attitude of mind, by reason of its destructive effect upon the organization of the personality through the increase of the difficulties for original and creative thinking implied in 'doing.'"

¹ A person in a morbid physical condition due to psychic causes.

The pathological conservative must not be confounded with the milder type who becomes conservative by merely growing old. However, even the ordinary conservatism is rather more a product of disposition and training than of years. At what age does the individual begin to stand pat? When does a man lose the ability to get a new idea, to change convictions or a point of view? At any age. Some, indeed, never get a new idea. They imitate in thought the prevailing modes of the social group to which they happen to belong, or to which they aspire. Fifteen, however, is an age at which a great number, perhaps the majority of those who do at least a little thinking of their own, harden into conventional patterns of thought and behavior. Others keep changing and growing intellectually up to thirty, some even up to forty-five, while just a few display to the very end that intellectual pliability which is intelligence informed by acquired knowledge.

¶ 7.—RESTLESSNESS DUE TO INHIBITION.

The conservative adds to social unrest whenever he saddles upon humanity an unreasonable or socially useless inhibition. The present unrest is due in part, as almost anyone will admit, to a bad adjustment of stimulation and inhibition. Social conditions often stimulate what social control, expressed in one of its various forms, prohibits. The near-sighted conservative often stresses only the prohibitions. A sane social order will attempt to reduce the suggestions

that lead to unwholesome conditions rather than merely to try to check the final issuing forth of impulses freely stimulated.

Some of our unrest is certainly due to a situation which Stanley Hall has described thus : " No decade in history ever began to witness such momentous changes as those which have occurred since 1914. These changes have been political, economic, cultural and even hygienic, and have been practically world wide. Is there any one dominant trend among all these complex tendencies which have ushered us so suddenly into the new world—for such it is—upon which we look out today ? I have long pondered this question, and, as a lifelong student of the deeper currents that control mansoul, have found an answer that seems to me most satisfying, *viz.*, the fundamental impulse that has caused nearly all the troubles of recent years is the growing instinct of revolt against external constraints and control. It is more than kurophobia,¹ or the Freudian² resentment against all fatherly authority, and even more than social inhibitions ; these are, at most, only its negative manifestations ; it is, at root, a new impulse toward spontaneity, self-expression and self-determination, or to live again from within outward."

Human nature never found extended coercion so

1 Morbid fear of authority.

2 Psycho-analytic theory originated by Dr. Sigmund Freud, an Austrian neurologist, that ascribes most mental and nervous disorders to some sort of suppressed emotions caused by inhibitions.

difficult to accept. The wise way, therefore, to provide the control without which social life becomes intolerable for all is to increase the influences that work together to produce self-discipline. Decreasing harmful social stimulations is a much safer program than merely to attempt the checking of unintelligent or vicious impulses.

This program of safety through a lessening of tension applies particularly to our industrial situation. It is in its denial of self-expression for the worker that machine production has contributed so much to our present social discontent. The task now facing modern industry is two-fold. It must continue to produce and distribute cheaply that human wants may be satisfied; it must also give back to the worker the self-expression and pride of workmanship that disappeared with the coming of the factory era. Until it meets the second obligation, in spite of its discharge of the first, discontent will increase among the producers.

§ 8—EDUCATION AND SOCIAL UNREST.

A social obligation which rests upon education is the building into the public mind of an adequate knowledge of the fundamental social and human problem. The chief objective of educational effort is better men and women, people of wiser minds, greater vitality and sanity, more adequately prepared for the ordeals of life. It is a stupid social philosophy that considers any other problem the chief

problem. More wealth with no larger men and women to enjoy it will add greater troubles to those we now have. More leisure with no stronger character on the part of those who try to use it will extend moral deterioration until existence itself will be threatened. Any heroic social effort to equalize the desirable conditions of life by forceful legislation which is not reinforced by an increase in general intelligence and a greater degree of self-control will end in undermining our present social justice and progress without providing any workable substitutes.

The philosophy that all men and women need for social well-being is more things and more time for their enjoyment, the theory of the fat belly, has already shaken civilization and given thinking people fair warning that human nature can not be made socially sane by mere prosperity even if it is distributed so that no man has more than his neighbor.

Every contact that science makes with living things discloses the falseness of that easy-going interpretation of human need which sees in it only one thing necessary—a greater amount of wealth for a greater number of people. Every unbiased experience with natural law teaches the scientists that human welfare demands struggle, that any effort to recreate the universe so as to abolish the recognition of natural inequalities among human beings will prove futile and sooner or later disastrous. In other words, the one hopeful objective for social striving in the moral discipline of human nature.

Those who seek to further the welfare of society will emphasize growth in general intelligence as the means of moral discipline. This increase of general intelligence must especially emphasize the importance of the law of cause and effect. There can be no doubt that profound changes in social and perhaps political conditions are at hand, and no one with any degree of thoughtfulness expects social life to remain as it is. We need to rid ourselves of whatever we have socially outgrown and can safely replace by what is socially more just and desirable, but we can not safely ignore the key position occupied by general intelligence in this process of change. There are those among us who expect to make advance by appealing to class passion so as to create by revolution an ideal society. They forget the enormously significant meaning of the statement of Goldwin Smith's, "Let us never glorify revolution." Such persons foolishly regard the selfishness of some men as the only thing hampering others. If the scientist gets any insight from his life calling he, of all men, is best prepared to insist that the evolution which passes slowly, as a result of increasing general knowledge, from things that are to things as they may be is the only substantial social progress.

The scientist, however, is failing still to do his part in stimulating this growth of social knowledge at one important point. He is not influencing public education to the degree that he must in the future if progress is to be made. As a result, the public

school does not yet in any satisfactory measure build into public opinion through early instruction that tremendous concept of causal law which is the intellectual guardian of social progress. Our social security demands more influence from science in our schools and more respect for science on the part of those who inform our public mind.

CHAPTER II

PROBLEM OF POVERTY

The central fact with respect to poverty is the smallness of wealth and of incomes which characterizes the poor. In one sense this smallness of income is the immediate cause of poverty. But it is more true to say that it is the peculiar characteristic of poverty, and the causes of this smallness of income are the true causes of poverty. Let us now consider these causes and the characteristics of poverty in modern society.

§ 1.—SOCIALISTIC THEORY OF POVERTY.

The socialists ordinarily account for poverty on the ground that it is caused by the exploitation of the worker by the capitalists. In one of the best of the recent statements of the socialist point of view this explanation is offered, closing with the following conclusion :—

“ Thus our present system fails absolutely to satisfy the most primitive need of food, clothing and shelter, for a large section ; it imposes absolute failure on others struggling to meet that need, and it places such great difficulties in the way of others that they cannot enjoy life after these needs are satisfied ; it makes the grip of the vast majority of

men on a standard of life which is but moderately comfortable, precarious in the extreme; it secures incomes to those who do no service and by allowing the growth of monopolies it tends to increase the power of those enjoying economic advantages and so it encourages exploitation. . . . The socialist charge against capitalism is that it is a method of exploitation, and its development produces conditions which forbid and render impossible its continued existence."¹

It is evident that several of the assertions with regard to the present system in the above citation are perfectly true. But it is not necessarily true that poverty is due entirely or even in the main to exploitation.

The single-taxers also account for poverty on grounds of exploitation, but an exploitation not so extensive as that of the capitalist, namely, the exploitation of the land by the landowner. Here is Henry George's explanation of the causes of poverty :—

"The reason why, in spite of the increase of productive power, wages constantly tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living, is that, with increase in productive power, rent tends to even greater increase, thus producing a constant tendency to the forcing down of wages."²

Another Henry George of a later generation

¹ J. Ramsay Macdonald, *The Socialist Movement*, 1911, pp. 77-8.

² Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, 1880, p. 280.

broadens out considerably the range of this process of exploitation which causes poverty :—

“ We have found the unequal distribution of wealth, which so distracts public and private life in the Republic, to be due to Government favors to individuals, operating in all instances as if private laws had been made expressly for their benefit. We have seen the Government favors or privileges fall into four general classes : monopolies of natural opportunities, tariff and other taxes on production and its fruits, highway grants, and incorporation powers and immunities. We have seen that the first two of these can be destroyed by shifting the entire weight of taxation from production to land values, that highways should be taken over, and that then would easily follow simplified processes of incorporation and modified judicial practices.”¹

F. C. Howe’s statement of the Single-tax theory of the causation of poverty is as follows :—

“ Herein is the crux of the social puzzle. Herein is the explanation of increasing poverty in the midst of increasing wealth ; of misery, destitution, and suffering on the one hand, and unimaginable luxury and waste on the other. In this struggle for the use of the land and the speculative values to which it gives rise, is the solution of the paroxysms of industry which periodically afflict the commercial world. It is this, too, that explains the vacant fields and idle workshops, while millions of men are

¹ Henry George, Jr., *The Menace of Privilege*, 1906, p. 409.

seeking employment."¹

¶ 2.—WASTE THEORY AND OTHER UNILATERAL THEORIES.

Another theory of poverty based upon exploitation is that of Novicow. He apparently regards poverty as being due to the waste caused by exploitation in general, including many different kinds of exploitation.

Still another theory which lays great emphasis upon waste, especially that caused by luxury, but does not lay so much emphasis upon exploitation, is stated in the following citation:—

"Two evils now stand in the way of a better share for the workers in the good things of the earth. These are the dearness and scarcity of capital and the dearness and scarcity of food and raw materials. Both of these evils every one of us can help to correct by spending less on luxuries, and living more sensible lives, in accordance with a more genuine standard of comfort, based on our real wants instead of mimicry of the extravagance of our neighbours."²

A statement of the causes of poverty which is somewhat broader than the preceding, probably because it is more eclectic, is the following. Referring to the classification of the causes of poverty the

¹ F. C. Howe, *Privilege and Democracy in America*, 1910, pp. 116—7.

² Hartley Withers, *Poverty and Waste*, 1914, pp. 176—7.

writer says :—

"A new classification, which reflects the recent change in thought, was offered at the National Conference in 1906 by Dr. Lee K. Frankel. It consists of only four divisions: ignorance, industrial inefficiency, exploitation of labor and defects in governmental supervision of the welfare of citizens. Logic seems to demand that we reduce these four causes to two, cutting out ignorance and inefficiency as results. To some form of exploitation or to some defect in governmental efficiency most of the circumstances which we commonly regard as causes may be ascribed. For practical purposes, however, these two causes must be broken up into their components, and to account for all the poverty in existence, a third heading must be used expressing the defective will that chooses unwisely in the face of knowledge and the selffishness that evades responsibility."¹

It is evident that all of these theories are too unilateral. Or, at any rate, each of these writers has failed to state his theory in such a fashion as to indicate the multiplicity of the factors in the causation of poverty. The Webbs have criticised similar theories in the following words :—

"There are those who hold—along with Professor Bernard Bosanquet and the Council of the Charity Organization Society of London—that destination in

¹ Lillian Brandt, *The Causes of Poverty*, in the Political Science Quarterly, Vol. XXIII, No. 4, Dec., 1908, p. 644.

all its forms is invariably associated with a defective 'citizen-character,' a 'failure' in the person who is destitute. There are those who hold—along with Professor Devine, who is the Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York—that practical experience among the poor demonstrates that the destitution of great cities is, in all its manifestations, essentially the result of the bad economic conditions to which the individual is subjected. And among those who attribute all forms of destitution to personal 'failure' there are the Eugenists, who ascribe this deficiency of the individual to a descent from a bad stock; and the Educationalists, who ascribe it to defective nurture. These abstract controversies, which delighted the Early Victorians, are, we venture to think, amid the concrete scientific methods of twentieth century administration, somewhat belated."¹

§ 3.—ORGANIC AND EVOLUTIONARY THEORIES OF POVERTY.

Nevertheless there is more or less truth in each of these previously stated theories. There has been and doubtless is a great deal of exploitation, in the sense that certain individuals are supported by the productive labor of others. Parasitism is perhaps a better name for this, because in many cases the exploiting is done unconsciously by those who benefit by it. But the elimination of all exploitation or parasitism would certainly not exterminate poverty

¹ S. and B. Webb, *The Prevention of Destitution*, 1911, pp. 8—9.

completely. Indeed, until a radically different system of production is evolved, a certain amount of exploitation is probably essential and inevitable.

There has been and certainly is a great deal of waste—in production through inefficiency, and in consumption through luxury. But the saving of all of this waste would by no means prevent poverty entirely, for we know very well that even if all of the wealth of the world were divided up more or less equally, the share of each individual would not be large enough to give him a standard of living which would put him well above or even at all above the poverty line. So that the amount produced will have to be greatly increased, as well as the amount which is wasted saved, before poverty can be abolished entirely or in large part.

A more philosophic view of poverty than these theories is one which regards it as a disease of society, or as an abnormal or pathological social phenomenon. Such a view is more philosophic because it looks at poverty from the point of view of society as a whole. The organicists in sociology, who regard society as an organism like the biological organism, have pushed this conception of poverty to an extreme which is absurd, in view of the fact that society is very different from the biological organism. Other writers have called poverty a disease merely in sense that it is a condition which is bad and harmful from the point of view of human welfare. We ourselves take a similar view of poverty in our

treatment of pathological social conditions, without implying any organismic theory of society.

A still more philosophic conception of poverty, and one which is more correct sociologically, is of poverty as one aspect of social evolution. That is to say, we regard poverty as the conditions of a group or class of individuals which has apparently been one of the necessary products of the social process. An explanation of its existence therefore necessitates a thorough-going explanation of social evolution, which fact coincides with our view of the multiplicity of the factors in the causation of poverty. Some writers who have studied this subject in this broad fashion have inclined to the view that poverty is the condition of those who are being eliminated in a social struggle for existence by means of a selective process which is similar to natural selection in the organic world. But, as we have intimated in the last paragraph, it is not safe to draw so strict an analogy between the social and organic worlds.

§ 4.—CONDITIONS OF POVERTY.

Turning now from the causes of poverty, let us touch briefly upon the conditions of poverty. As we have already noted, many of these conditions are the results of poverty, but have become its causes as well.

It should hardly be necessary to describe the conditions of poverty here. There can be few if any readers of this book who have not seen some-

thing of these conditions with their own eyes, and who have not learned much about these conditions from numerous sources of information. In every large city are to be found the districts of congested population. Here are the dwelling houses and tenements in which many of the poor are crowded and live in conditions which are uncomfortable and insanitary. The furnishings of these homes usually are insufficient for comfort and for health. The food is inadequate and of poor quality. The results from these conditions are to be found in physical weakness and widespread disease. As a consequence, the adults are inefficient at their work, and the children unable to learn with facility in the schools. These are the districts in which the morbidity and mortality rates are high. Frequently also they are the districts in which the rates for crime and intemperance are high. It goes without saying that forces for crime and intemperance are to be found everywhere in human society. But there is no doubt that the conditions of the poor stimulate both these evil tendencies. This is peculiarly true of intemperance. It is in the main the misery of the poor which impels them to seek the temporary relief furnished by alcoholic beverages, thus inevitably leading them to a far worse state of misery. Thus it is that intemperance, which is to so great an extent a result of poverty, becomes as well a potent force for poverty.

Under these conditions it is hardly possible for

the family life to develop to its fullest extent. On account of lack of leisure and of necessary facilities, both the children and the adults fail to get a sufficient amount of recreation. For similar reasons there is obviously little opportunity for cultural development among the poor.

Nor are these conditions limited to large cities, for they are to be found also in hovels on the outskirts of small towns and villages, and even in the open country. Furthermore, most of these conditions characterize the homeless vagrants and mendicants who wander from place to place, usually in greater destitution than the poor who have homes.

The results from these conditions to the poor themselves can perhaps be best summed up in the one word misery. But there are certain evil results from poverty to the rest of society. Even though there are certain individuals who profit from the misery of the poor, society as a whole suffers from poverty in certain ways. As we have already noted, the prevalence of disease, crime and certain kinds of vice is stimulated by poverty, and, as all of these evils are more or less contagious, their prevalence is by no means limited to the poor themselves. The cost of caring for many dependents who might be self-supporting, and of a considerable number of criminals whose crimes are due to poverty, falls upon society as a whole. Looked at from the esthetic point of view, the presence of poverty is a blot and an eyesore upon civilization, and the life of society

as a whole will be raised to a higher plane and made more refined if this blot can be removed.

§ 5.—POVERTY AND DEGENERATION.

Before closing this chapter it may be well to add a few words upon a subject which is sometimes discussed in connection with poverty, namely, racial and national decadence and degeneration. Some students of the subject have thought that such decadence and degeneration have in certain cases been due entirely or in part to poverty. Some of these students have thought that this was due to the transmission by means of inheritance of the weakness and disease caused by poverty, or of the effects of such weakness and disease. Others have thought that it was due to the fact that poverty encouraged the multiplication and the preservation of the unfit, either directly, or indirectly through the unwise philanthropy stimulated by the existence of poverty. But, on the other hand, still other students of the subject have thought that poverty has acted and does act as a selective force for the elimination of the unfit in the social struggle for existence. If this last theory is true, poverty must be a force against rather than for racial and national degeneration.

The causes of racial and national decadence and degeneration are very numerous and complex, and differ greatly from one instance of such degeneration to another. Many believe that certain races are

very inferior in their ability to develop or to assimilate culture. It is probable that racial differences have played some part in determining the differences in the cultural status of these races. But it is very doubtful if any great cultural differences can be explained solely by differences of race. In every one of these cases other important differences as well can be found.

The physical environment has in many places been a serious drawback to the development of culture and the production of wealth. It is a striking fact that most of cultural evolution has taken place in the temperate zones, and not in the tropical or the arctic regions. Great heat, excessive cold, an arid soil, swampy ground, mountainous districts, etc., have all served as factors to arrest the cultural evolution of the inhabitants of the regions characterized by these features. This fact is perhaps illustrated most strikingly where a change in climate has arrested, has driven away, or has destroyed completely a culture. Sometimes a climate has assisted indirectly in arresting a culture and causing it to decline by fostering certain diseases.

Cultural factors usually play an important part in bringing about such decadence and degeneration. Certain religious, moral, and economic institutions may serve as arresting and retrogressive forces, as when a rigid caste system impedes progress, or a class system on an economic basis, in which certain classes are being exploited to an excessive degree

by other classes, develops. Cultural relations may play a similar part in various ways, as when one nation is threatened by a stronger one, and when a weaker people is subjected or enslaved by a stronger people. Migrations of peoples may play a similar part, as when they cause an excessive degree of ethnic heterogeneity, thus impeding national development.

War has doubtless played a considerable part in causing racial and national decadence and degeneration. There has been a good deal of study devoted recently to the way in which war has caused a process of reversed selection in which the physically superior individuals have been killed off while the weaker individuals have survived, thus leading to racial degeneration. It should, however, be remembered that, on the other hand, war has also been a beneficial selective force by eliminating in part certain undesirable types, such as the turbulent, the refractory, and the unsympathetic.

Various alarmist writers of the present day assert that certain features of our modern civilization are powerful forces for decadence. It is asserted that the pressure of a very complex civilization gives rise to neurotic tendencies which manifest themselves in certain forms of art and literature, in an increase of suicide, and in many other ways. Some assert that national virility is frequently sacrificed for advancement along certain cultural lines, as illustrated in modern humanitarianism, the decline of patriotism,

anti-militarism, the development of individualism, evolution along certain esthetic lines, etc.

Now it is evident that many of these factors give rise to poverty by restricting the production of wealth and by causing its unequal distribution. The poverty thus brought into existence may in turn become a factor for hastening the process of decadence and degeneration. But it is very doubtful if in any or many of these cases poverty was the initial or the principal cause of this process. It is evident that poverty could not have such an effect through the hereditary transmission of physical and mental traits caused in the individual by poverty, for we know that acquired characters cannot be inherited. With respect to whether poverty is a good or a bad selective force, we have seen that there is difference of opinion. Unfortunately we know very little as yet with regard to the selective process among men in human society.

As one writer has said:—"One of the great books of our century will be some day written on the selection of men, the screening of human life through the actions of man and the operation of the institutions men have built up. It will be a survey of the stream of social history, its whirls and eddies, rapids and still waters, and the effect of each and all of its conditions on the heredity of men. The survival of the fit and the unfit in all degrees and conditions will be its subject-matter.... It will set down soberly and statistically the array of facts

which as yet no one possesses; and the new Darwin whose work it shall be must, like his predecessor, spend twenty-five years in the gathering of 'all facts that can possibly bear on the question.'¹

It is quite probable that unwise philanthropy has checked natural selection somewhat, and has thereby done harm. But it is, to say the least, highly improbable that poverty has to any great extent been a factor for racial and national decadence and degeneration in the past. Whether or not it will be so in the future, it is still more difficult to say.

¹ David S. Jordan, *The Human Harvest, A Study of the Decay of Races through the Survival of the Unfit*, 1912, pp. 119-20.

CHAPTER III

DEPENDENTS AND DEFECTIVES

We shall now discuss briefly the social treatment of the principal types of dependents and defectives. In doing so we shall illustrate the application of the humanitarian and philanthropic principles. We shall also describe some of the more superficial measures for the prevention of dependency and defectiveness, leaving to the latter part of the book the consideration of the fundamental preventive measures which require a more or less thoroughgoing reorganization of society.

§ 1.—DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

It goes without saying that infancy and childhood are periods of dependency in the life of every individual. The normal condition during these years is for a child to live with and be cared for by its parents. If for any reason the parents and other relatives of a child fail entirely or in part to support it, there arises the abnormal form of dependency in which we are interested as a social problem. It is obviously important that these abnormally dependent children should receive proper care, not only for their own sakes but also for the sake of society, because most of them have before them long lives.

during which they may or may not be useful citizens, and this depends largely upon the kind of bringing up they are given.

It is hardly necessary to state that when one or both of the parents are living it is best to keep the children with the parents, if the parents are fit companions for their children. For this reason it is frequently desirable to give outdoor relief¹ in order to maintain a home which would otherwise be broken up. But such relief should invariably be given with the utmost discrimination, in order to avoid pauperizing the family and making the parents idle, shiftless, and incompetent. But if the parents are dead, or are incapable, or unfit to care for the children within their own home, and there are no relatives who can take the children, there are at least two ways in which the children may be brought up. They may be placed in the homes of strangers who either adopt them and assume the cost of bringing them up, or who care for the children for a remuneration. This is doubtless the best method of caring for dependent children, when suitable foster homes can be found for them. But it is very important that the charitable societies or the public agencies that have charge of this work take great care in selecting these homes, and then watch over the children after they go into

1 The charitable aid given to the poor by admitting them into institutions is called "*indoor relief*" or "*institutional relief*," while the aid given to those who live outside the institutions, generally at their own homes, is called "*outdoor relief*."

them in order to be sure that they are not abused in their foster homes. If suitable foster homes cannot be found, these children must be placed in institutions. There has been much criticism of these institutions on the ground that their management was so much routinized as to repress the individuality and initiative of the child. This has been largely true in the past, and is still true in many institutions. But the tendency now is towards the cottage system¹ in these institutions, in which the attempt is made to reproduce the family life as much as possible in these cottages, and to give free play for the development of the individuality of the child in the life of the institution.

The measures which may be taken to prevent dependency during childhood or during the later life of those who are now children are very numerous. They include suitable food and sufficient rest for the mothers during pregnancy, medical attendance at the time of birth, pure milk during infancy, medical treatment for infantile diseases, sufficient nutrition throughout childhood, suitable means of recreation,

1 When a charitable institution is so constructed as to consist of a large number of small houses, sometimes connected by passages, permitting the complete separation of the sexes, separate hospital cottages, and a central administration building, such a system is called the "*cottage system*." There each cottage is organized as one family, and thus family atmosphere is given to the inmates as far as possible. This is far superior to the old "*institutional system*," in which only a few large houses, as in schools and hospitals, are provided for all purposes, and the natural home-like atmosphere is remarkably lacking.

a good elementary education and some vocational training, etc. It goes without saying that in the upper classes parents are able to supply all these needs in the rearing of their children. But parents in the poorer classes are usually unable to supply some or all of these needs, so that it becomes necessary for private philanthropists or public agencies to make suitable provision. Hence it is that we have medical charities, milk depots, nurseries, school lunches, fresh air funds,¹ vocational schools, etc. This situation will continue as long as these lower classes are not receiving sufficiently large incomes to be able to provide these necessities without the aid of private charity or of special assistance from the state. It is likely that under a more socialized system in the future some of these services will be rendered by the state to society as a whole. For example, this will probably soon be true of vocational training. But they will then be upon an entirely different status from their present status; when they are either charitable private measures or measures of public relief for the poorer classes.

§ 2—THE AGED POOR.

At the other extreme of life from childhood is another large group of dependents, namely, the aged poor. When we bear in mind that there is a large number of individuals with very small incomes, it is

¹ Funds contributed to some charity, to give slum children holidays in the country.

easy to believe that many workers reach old age without being able to make any provision or adequate provision for the time when they can no longer work.

There are two principal methods of providing for aged dependents, either by furnishing them outdoor relief in their homes, or to put them into institutions. Because of charitable character given to most of these institutions, even when they are maintained by the state, the aged poor are usually much averse to entering them, because they regard it as an indication of being pauperized. Furthermore, in many of these institutions aged couples are separated entirely or in large part from each other, and in many other ways these institutions are very badly managed. So that it is usually a sad and heart-breaking experience to enter one of these institutions. If however the stigma of pauperism could be removed from these institutions, if their aged inmates were not subjected to the wholly unnecessary and indefensible brutality of being separated from their spouses, and if they were maintained in a reasonable degree of comfort, institutional care would be preferable to outdoor relief. Some of the best institutions have attained this ideal in considerable part, and are able to offer their inmates something approximating an independent home life. There is, of course, not the same objection to institutional life for the aged that there is for the young, since the aged only need care for the rest of their lives, while the children need prepara-

tion for their adult lives.

The preventive measures against old age dependency which have usually been proposed are insurance and pensions. The first of these usually demands a standard rate of income sufficiently high to permit of saving. A pension system also involves the question of income to a certain extent, as well as certain other economic and political questions of great importance. We shall therefore take up the discussion of these preventive measures later in this book.

§ 3.—THE UNEMPLOYED.

Childhood and old age are inevitable causes of dependency which will always exist. Disease and defectiveness also will always be causes of dependency, though these causes will doubtless be lessened greatly in extent in the future. But we know that there is a great deal of dependency of persons who are capable of supporting themselves, but are not furnished the opportunity to do so. The dependency caused by involuntary unemployment is due to the present economic organization of society, and may conceivably be prevented under a better form of organization. But until that time comes, it will be necessary to furnish relief to the unfortunate victims of the present system.

If no better system of relief had been devised, this would have to be in the form of outdoor relief given in the homes of the unemployed. For the homeless unemployed relief should be provided in the form of

shelter and food furnished through institution like municipal lodging houses. Such aid is far superior to almsgiving on the street, mission shelters, soup kitchens, bread lines, etc. But it is very important that a system of outdoor relief, and of public lodging houses for the temporarily unemployed, should be administered with great discrimination, for otherwise much evil may be caused by it. This is illustrated by the system of poor relief which grew up under the English Poor Law in the early part of the nineteenth century. Under the name of "rates in aid of wages" relief was given freely, though not in large amounts, to the able-bodied unemployed, as well as to those who were receiving low wages. The result was that many workers were encouraged to remain unemployed or only partially employed in order to avail themselves of this relief, while the employers were encouraged to pay low wages and to expect the state to eke them out. It was this condition which aroused so much opposition to the old English Poor Law, and led to the demand on the part of many that no relief should be given to able-bodied persons. However, as is suggested above, this is hardly possible when so many persons are so frequently thrown out of employment through no fault of their own, and are left more or less destitute. But the relief should be given with the utmost discrimination, so that only the involuntary unemployed shall receive it, and so that they shall receive it only so long as it is im-

possible for them to secure work. Consequently such a system of relief should be closely related to methods of providing work for the unemployed, which will be mentioned presently.

Another method of tiding the unemployed over periods of unemployment is by means of insurance. There are many forms of unemployment insurance, such as private system of insurance administered by trade unions, etc.; private systems subsidized by the state; state systems, which may be compulsory or voluntary; etc.

A system of labor exchange helps a little towards preventing unemployment. In the first place, it saves the waste of a certain amount of time and effort on the part of both employees and employers in making the necessary connections. In the second place, it facilitates the exchange of workers between seasonal employments. In the third place, it reduces the number of casual workers engaged in occupations in which the work is very irregular. But it is obvious that a system of labor exchanges cannot create any work directly. It may indirectly stimulate a small increase in the amount of work by making it easier for employers to secure workers, and consequently to increase the scope of their enterprizes. But so long as there is a large reserve labor force upon which employers can draw, it is not likely to have this effect to any great extent.

It has been suggested that for the unemployed for whom work cannot be found and who are in

need of public relief shall be provided the opportunity to study a trade or receive some other form of instruction which will aid them later. Those receiving public relief might indeed be required to take this instruction. Thus they would be kept out of idleness and saved from the degenerating effects of idleness, as well as be in a better position to earn a living when they again become wage-earners. Such instruction might be given in connection with the labor exchanges which have been discussed above.

But it is evident that none of the methods suggested above remove the fundamental cause of unemployment, namely, the irregularity and lack of organization of industry. Fundamental preventive measures must be along two lines. In the first place, every able-bodied human being without distinction of sex, class, creed, etc., should be trained to do some kind of productive work. In the second place, industry should be so organized that there is a place in it for every laborer. Under such conditions there would be no unemployment in the sense in which we ordinarily use that term. Furthermore, with an efficient labor force entirely employed it would be possible to maintain every member of society above a comparatively high standard of living, while each worker would have to work much less than is the case on the average among those who now work. To what extent this ideal state is likely to be realized and how, we shall discuss later.

§ 4.—MENDICANTS AND VAGRANTS.

We come now to another group of the unemployed who may or may not be able-bodied, but who are usually voluntarily unemployed. This is the group of the mendicants and of vagrants who are usually mendicants also but of a migratory type. It is impossible here to go into a lengthy discussion of the causes of mendicancy and vagrancy, or of the different classes of mendicants and vagrants. Vagrancy is doubtless due to a certain extent to the spirit of adventure and the *wanderlust* which are to be found in all human beings. But these causes alone are not likely to lead to more than temporary vagrancy in early youth. Other causes are various abnormal and neuropathic traits which lead an individual to dislike work and a settled life. In many cases mendicancy and vagrancy are due to the fact that the individual is incapable of working, or has not been given the opportunity to work for so long that he has become a mendicant and vagrant. On the basis of an analysis of the causes of mendicancy and vagrancy it is possible to construct classifications of mendicants and vagrants. Among them are to be found the temporary mendicants and vagrants, who are in this condition on account of youth or lack of opportunity to work. Then there are the pauper mendicants and vagrants, who may have started out like the temporary ones but have become confirmed in these habits. The crippled mendicants are incapacitated in part or entirely from work, and use

their deformities and mutilations to secure alms. There are several kinds of fake mendicants, as, for example, those who pretend to be poor when they are not, those who simulate diseases and deformities, and the malingeringers who maim themselves in order to appeal to the sympathies of almsgivers. The semi-criminal and criminal mendicants and vagrants are those who are ready to commit crime, when a good opportunity to do so presents itself. The abnormal and pathological vagrants can be divided into many classes according to the psychoses and neuroses which give rise to their vagabondage.

It is impossible to determine the exact number of mendicants and vagrants in a country, but estimates which have been made indicate that they are sufficiently numerous to constitute a serious problem. The end to be attained in the treatment of this problem is if possible to put an end to mendicancy and vagrancy, and to furnish suitable relief to those of the mendicants and vagrants who are entitled to relief, and to force the others to become self-supporting. Mendicancy and vagrancy should be prohibited because, while the aid given to them is in some cases justified, so long as begging is permitted in any form there will be numerous imposters who become parasites upon the community and encourage indiscriminate giving. Furthermore, criminals are frequently aided by being able to carry on their criminal activities under the guise of mendicancy and vagrancy.

If a thoroughgoing system can be established, both

of these conditions can be wiped out entirely or almost entirely. In the first place is needed an efficient system of public relief, to which all cases of mendicancy and vagrancy can be referred to be carefully examined. Then if it proves to be an appropriate case for relief measures, outdoor or indoor relief as the case demands should be granted. If self-support is possible, effort should be made to secure work. If the mendicant or vagrant is unwilling to work, even though capable of doing so, he should be compelled to work. Especially should this be done if he displays a criminal character and tendencies, in which case he should be placed under careful surveillance.

It is impossible in this book to go into greater detail in the description of the methods which should be used in dealing with mendicancy and vagrancy. Excellent methods and institutions have been devised and established in certain European countries such as Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany. In these countries are to be found detention colonies, labor houses and colonies, etc., which, combined with discriminating methods of relief, prevent and repress mendicancy and vagrancy to a very large extent.

25.—THE DEFECTIVES AND THE DESTITUTE SICK.

We must now discuss briefly the care of defectives and the diseased. All those suffering from physical and mental defects and from disease are handicapped in the economic struggle for existence, and some of

them are entirely incapacitated from self-support. If such individuals belong to wealthy families, they do not usually become dependent upon private or public charity. Their position in society may indeed be no different from that of other wealthy persons who are not economically productive. But most of them are born into families that are able to care for them only in part or not at all, so that it becomes necessary for private charity or for the state to care for them. Because of their need for special care and attention the state sometimes assumes charge of them, even when they can be cared for by their families. Hence it is that these helpless persons form a special group of dependents.

The treatment of the blind must depend upon the causes of their blindness. If there is any possibility of a cure, every effort should be made to cure them. If there is no such possibility, special care and education must be provided for them. If they can be cared for in their own homes, it is well to do so, provided they can have suitable educational opportunities at the same time. But if they cannot be cared for in their homes, or cannot secure an education there, they should be placed in special institutions maintained preferably by the state. Here they should be given an education and training which will if possible fit them for self-support. If this is not possible, their education should at least fit them for passing as happy and satisfactory lives as their defect will permit.

The same is to be said with regard to the treatment of the deaf and dumb as has been said about the blind. If there is any possibility of a cure, every effort should be made to cure them. If not, they should be cared for in their homes, if that is feasible, or in special institutions. In any case, they should receive an education and training which will if possible make them self-supporting. They should in all cases be taught to speak, since there are very few if any for whom this is utterly impossible.

It is absolutely impossible to make any sort of estimate of the number of cripples in this country. This is partly because it is difficult to determine what degree of deformity constitutes being crippled. The causes of physical deformities are very numerous, some of the principal ones being tuberculosis, paralysis, rickets, scoliosis or curvature of the spine, etc. It is probably true that unless treatment is begun very early in life, in the majority of cases a cure is impossible. For this reason treatment should be begun very early, if there is any possibility of a cure. The crippled should be cared for in their homes, if possible, and if not, in special institutions. They should be given an education and training, which will, if possible, prepare them for self-support.

There can be no hope of cure in a genuine case of amentia, but proper treatment may bring about some improvement in certain cases. The milder types of aments may be kept under custodial care in their own homes. It is usually best to care for

the idiots and the low grade imbeciles in special institutions. The higher types of aments can be trained to perform services which will contribute towards their own support.

In many cases of dementia a cure may be possible, so that appropriate treatment should be given whenever there is a possibility of a cure. The milder types of the insane may be kept under custodial care in their own homes. The worst forms of dementia should ordinarily be cared for in special institutions. The milder dementes may be able to perform useful services, but as a general thing the insane are quite incapable of supporting themselves.

Epilepsy is a disease the causes and nature of which are still little understood. It may be possible to cure it in some cases. But usually it seems to be a permanent trait of its victim, and may therefore be classified as a defect. In its milder forms no special attention needs to be given to it. But in its graver forms, and especially if it leads to criminal tendencies, it should be cared for either by custodial care in the home or in special institutions.

It may appear inaccurate to speak of the inebriate at this point, since inebriety is primarily a habit, rather than a defect or a disease. But in its graver forms it frequently has a neuropathic basis, and is therefore in need of treatment as a disease or a defect. Some of the worst inebriates, especially if they display criminal tendencies, should have either custodial care in the home or should be cared for

in special institutions.

The prevention of these forms of defectiveness and the dependency which results from them we cannot discuss at length here. So far as such defectiveness is inherited, it can be prevented only by artificial selection. How feasible it is to do this we shall discuss in a later chapter, which deals with the subject of eugenics. Otherwise such defectiveness is certain to persist, unless it is eliminated by means of natural selection or variation, which are processes over which man has no control. So far as such defectiveness is due to environmental factors, it can be prevented by changes in the environment.

The medical charities take the forms of free medical treatment in the home, nursing, dispensaries where medical treatment and drugs are provided, hospitals for indoor treatment, etc. Much of this charity has been private. But the tendency now is for the state to undertake these functions. This tendency will doubtless continue, and will make it more feasible to unite remedial treatment with preventive measures. Through public health departments much hygienic and sanitary work is now being carried on, and will doubtless be greatly extended.

Various other lines of activity for the prevention and elimination of disease may be mentioned, some of these activities being private and others being public. For example, in many educational institutions courses on preventive medicine¹ are being taught,

¹ Prophylaxis.

which disseminate knowledge with respect to the prevention of disease. Certain more or less organized movements for the elimination of specific diseases are being carried on. Among them are the campaigns against smallpox, tuberculosis, typhoid fever, typhus, diphtheria, malaria, etc. The movement for the prevention of venereal diseases should also be mentioned in this connection.

Movements of a somewhat different character, which should also be mentioned, are the organized movements against the use of stimulants, narcotics, etc. While these movements are directed immediately against certain habits, it is well known that these habits frequently lead to disease and other physical and mental ills, so that such movements are in the last analysis movements against disease as well. Prominent examples of such movements are the campaigns against alcoholism and against the use of narcotic drugs. The vast amount of injury caused by the use of alcoholic beverages is too well known to need extended discussion here. While it is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy to what extent it is a cause of poverty and destitution, it is certain that it is one of the most important of the immediate causes of these great social evils. The use of drugs is even more baneful to the individual than that of alcoholic beverages, and since this habit seems to be spreading it may, if not checked, rival alcoholism in malignancy.

But it is not certain that these habits can be

fought directly with success. While it is possible to kill off the germs of disease without opposition from those who are threatened by them, it is frequently impossible to control the habits of men, especially when they are habits which they wish to retain, however harmful they may be. It is probable that these habits will be fought more successfully by indirect means, namely, by changing the conditions which induce men to acquire these habits.

The prevention of these defects and diseases would somewhat reduce the amount of dependency and destitution. Furthermore, it would protect the health and well-being of the public at large to a considerable extent, since many of these diseases are contagious. However, it must be remembered that there is danger in exaggerating the extent to which poverty and pauperism are due to disease. We may cite an opinion from a writer on this subject expressed in the following passage:—"We are apt to forget that, in all countries, at all ages, it is sickness to which the greatest bulk of destitution is immediately due."¹ The word "immediately" may save this statement from error, for without this word it would certainly be wrong. This is evident when we consider the extent to which poverty and dependency are caused by low wages and unemployment. As a matter of fact, defectiveness and disease are to a large extent due to a preexisting state of poverty,

¹ S. and B. Webb, *The Prevention of Destitution*, 1911, p. 15.

but then react upon that poverty so as to stimulate its increase to a considerable degree.

CHAPTER IV

CRIME AND SOCIAL CONTROL

All forms of human behavior come into being, in the first instance, in the course of the struggle of the individual for existence. Each individual must overcome the difficulties in the way of its existence if it is to survive. It must secure the food it needs, it must not succumb to the climate, it must defend itself against its enemies. The individuals which act in such a way as to attain these ends will survive, while those who fail to do so will be eliminated. So that there takes place a selective process in the course of which some individuals survive and are perpetuated, while other individuals are eliminated. In this fashion the struggle for existence determines what forms of behavior are to persist.

§ 1.—THE CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL INTERESTS.

In every social group conflict arises between the interests of the individual and the welfare of the group. Every person experiences impulses and desires which if gratified would injure other persons, and would give rise to continual warfare which would prevent social organization. These impulses and desires arise out of the instincts and emotions

which are the principal factors in the determination of human behavior.

These instincts and emotions lead sometimes to social and sometimes to antisocial behavior. For example, the instinct of pugnacity and the emotion of anger are continually giving rise to acts of violence. These acts are usually injurious to society, though sometimes they are committed in the defense of society. Sexual impulses also sometimes give rise to acts of violence which are anti-social in their character. But the sexual impulses usually arouse a tender emotion which stimulates sympathetic feelings and frequently leads to acts of kindness. The parental instincts and emotions cause numerous altruistic acts of self-sacrifice, and are therefore powerful social forces. But, on the other hand, these instincts and emotions sometimes lead to anti-social acts, as when a parent does injury to many persons in behalf of his or her offspring. In similar fashion many other instincts and emotions under certain conditions lead to social behavior, and under other conditions lead to anti-social behavior. Some of these dynamic forces lead more frequently to social behavior, and other forces lead more frequently to anti-social behavior. But every human trait may be manifested either in a social or in an anti-social manner.

Social groups like individuals are engaged in a struggle for existence. It goes without saying that the survival of individuals is of primary importance,

for without individuals there could be no groups. But in every social or partially social species the survival of the individual depends in part upon the survival of the group to which it belongs. Consequently, the behavior of the members of the group must in the long run promote the survival of the group. Thus it is that social instincts, sympathetic feelings, and intellectual activities which are socially directed tend to be preserved and encouraged in the social struggle for existence. On the other hand, anti-social instincts and feelings, and intellectual activities which are anti-socially directed, tend either to be eliminated, or, when too deeply rooted in human nature to be eliminated, to be restrained.

§ 2.—THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES AND DEFINITION OF CRIME.

The most obvious feature of crime is that it is created by the law and is penalized by the law. The great majority of criminal acts are sins of commission. They are acts forbidden by the law on pain of punishment. Some crimes, however, are sins of omission. Such a crime is the failure to perform an act required by the law.

However, the legal definition of crime is hardly broad enough for our purpose, because the crimes which the law has designated have varied greatly from time to time and from place to place. We must distinguish features which have been more or

less characteristic of crimes in general at all times and places.

It has generally been true that criminal acts have also been immoral acts. There are, however, occasional exceptions to this rule. Furthermore, the great majority of immoral acts are not criminal, so that it would be impossible to identify a crime by its immorality alone. Since they are immoral acts, crimes are almost universally recognized as wrong and as harmful to society. They usually include a considerable portion of the more serious immoral acts. Hence crimes are, generally speaking, the more serious of the anti-social acts, and are sometimes called the major anti-social acts.

It is also true of crimes that usually they are acts of such a nature that it is more or less practicable to repress them. They are ordinarily acts which affect other persons directly. Consequently, it is usually known when they have been committed, and the injured persons are as a rule anxious to have the criminals punished. These persons are therefore ready to help the agents of the law to apprehend the criminal and to convict him of crime.

Furthermore, a crime usually is an anti-social act of such a nature that its repression is necessary or is supposed to be necessary to the preservation of the existing system of society. In other words, crimes are supposed to include the anti-social acts which are of life-or-death importance to the exist-

ing society, but may not include many acts which, while they are harmful socially, are not of such grave importance. As we shall see later forms of behavior which might be fatal to one type of society would not necessarily be fatal to another type of society, and might even be beneficial to it. This fact explains in part the differences between one society and another in the kinds of acts which are stigmatized as criminal.

Crime may, therefore, be defined as follows: *A crime is an act forbidden and punished by the law, which is almost always immoral according to the prevailing ethical standard, which is usually harmful to society, which it is ordinarily feasible to repress by penal measures, and whose repression is necessary or is supposed to be necessary to the preservation of the existing social order.*

§ 3.—CRIMES CREATED BY RELIGIOUS, DESPOTIC, AND CLASS LEGISLATION.

Acts have frequently been stigmatized as criminal for religious or magical reasons. The prototype of this kind of social repression exists among savage peoples in the form of taboo. If a savage believes that it will be displeasing to spiritual power for him to commit a certain act, he will refrain from doing it in order to avoid the vengeance which the spiritual power would otherwise wreak upon him and the group to which he belongs. Or the savage may not personify the spiritual power to this extent,

but may believe that its automatic reaction to his act will be of such a nature as to do him injury. But if he does commit this act, his group is very likely to wreak vengeance upon him for thus endangering the welfare of the group, and this vengeance constitutes a primitive form of punishment. To an outsider it will frequently be obvious that the observance of the taboo is doing the individual and his group far more harm than its violation. But to the believer in a spiritual power of such a nature it will be perfectly reasonable to regard the violation of the taboo as immoral and criminal.

The same principle holds throughout every religion. No religion which has acquired a considerable following has failed to make criminal at law some at least of the acts which its tenets forbade. The history of the occidental civilization is particularly rich in these instances, owing to the inheritance from the Hebrew theocracy. The Hebrew Yahveh was a stern and vengeful god. Consequently, the Hebrew religion and law regarded it as man's duty to punish offenses against God in order to avert divine vengeance inflicted by the Hebrew deity. The Christian religion borrowed this idea along with much of the Hebrew religion. Consequently, the severity of the penal law among many Christian nations is to be explained in part by the fact that crimes have been punished not only as anti-social acts, but also as violations of divine law.

Religion has frequently condemned on religious grounds an act which was already regarded as immoral, thus adding a supernatural sanction to the prohibition already existing against the act. In this manner religion has been a force for morality and the maintenance of society. But in other cases religion has condemned and has succeeded in making criminal many acts which could on no other ground be regarded as harmful. In recent history the puritanical nature of much of the religious teaching condemned and made criminal many forms of amusement which are now generally regarded as innocent and beneficial.

Whenever religion succeeds in stigmatizing as criminal acts which are not regarded as objectionable in any other way, most of the general characteristics of crime mentioned above do not apply. These acts usually do no harm to individuals or to society, they are not generally regarded as immoral unless the professional religionists succeed in educating public opinion to the point of thinking so, and their repression is not needed for the preservation of the existing system of society. Frequently also they are acts which it is not feasible to repress by penal measures.

As I have already indicated, there has been a good deal of penal legislation in the interests of despots. Much of the legislation concerning monarchs and royal families has been of this nature. For example, in the ancient English law many of

the acts made treasonable by the law were acts directed against the royal family, but which would not necessarily have done any injury to society at large. Such legislation still exists in certain countries in the form of laws penalizing acts of *lèse majesté*. As the power of the kingship has declined, the extent of such legislation has lessened. It has been encouraged in the past by the divine traits which have been attributed to kings, and which have not yet been entirely forgotten. This belief in a relationship between kings and divinity has arisen out of the fact that the kingship and godhood have in part the same origin in the minds of men.

But there has probably been even more penal legislation in the interests of classes. Whenever a class has succeeded in gaining the ascendancy politically, economically, or otherwise, it has invariably enacted more or less penal legislation in its own interests. At various times and places the military class, the landholding class, the capitalist class, has passed legislation in its own favor. When the feudal barons in Europe attained the supremacy, they created laws penalizing the peasants who tried to leave their land, thus making the workers on their land practically their slaves. Up to the last century in England poaching was severely punished, because this was a violation of the vested rights of the landowning aristocracy. Today nothing is more jealously safeguarded by the law than the property rights of capital.

It is evident that crimes created by despotic and class legislation do not conform in the main to the characteristics of crime described above. The acts penalized by such legislation usually do not injure society outside of the small group in whose interest the legislation has been passed, they are frequently not regarded as immoral by the public at large, and their repression may not be necessary for the preservation of the existing society. In the past there has been a vast amount of sumptuary legislation regulating sometimes in great detail the life of the public at large at the will of the despot or of the ruling class. Religion has also played an important part in determining the character of sumptuary legislation.

§ 4.—VICIOUS ACTS STIGMATIZED AS CRIMINAL.

An act is sometimes stigmatized as criminal on the ground that it is vicious, even though it does not conform in the main to the general characteristics of crime mentioned above. It is an act which is or is supposed to be harmful to society, but which does no harm to any one directly, and which can frequently be carried on in secret with little fear for detection. Recently there is a strong tendency to penalize acts which are regarded by the public at large as vicious, as, for example, gambling, drunkenness, extra-marital sexual relations, etc. This situation raises the practical question as to whether it is feasible to repress vicious acts by

penal means, and, if these laws are certain to become dead letters, whether it would not be preferable to use indirect means to attain this end.

Still another ground upon which acts are sometimes penalized is in order to stimulate public opinion against these acts. This has been done in the past for various reasons, as, for example, for religious reasons. It is often done nowadays in the interests of public sanitation, public safety, etc. There are many acts which do not injure any one directly and apparently have no evil results, and yet which cause much harm. On account of their apparent innocuousness there is no public sentiment against these acts. They may not even be regarded as vicious, much less as deserving penal treatment. But when their dangerousness is discovered the government may prohibit these acts, in the first place, to call attention to their harmful character, and, in the second place, to discourage people from committing them. An example of this sort of legislation is the law against spitting on the sidewalk in American cities. Until scientific research had revealed the fact that tuberculosis and other diseases are spread by germ in the sputum the dangerousness of such a practice was not recognized. Since this discovery was made this act has been forbidden by the law in many places. The complicated life of our modern civilization, especially under the urban conditions of a large city has made many kinds of conduct socially harmful which otherwise would not

be harmful, and has led to much legislation of this sort. Here again the practical question may be raised as to the advisability of dealing with these acts by means of penal methods, or as to whether indirect methods would not be preferable.

We can now see that there have been and still are many instances of social control in the form of penal repression which are not beneficial, and frequently are positively harmful. But obviously there is a limit to these instances, because an excessive number of them would lead to the destruction of society. In the course of social evolution there has taken place a process of the selection and survival of the desirable methods of control, so that social control has become more and more effective. Consequently, penal repression is now inspired not so much by blind vengeance as by the desire to secure the deterrence from and the prevention of anti-social acts.

§ 5.—THE DEFECTIVE TRAITS OF THE CRIMINAL CLASS.

In the light of the preceding discussion we may expect to find at any time and place those persons criminal who are most likely to commit the acts stigmatized as crimes at that time and place. For this reason it may appear as if every social system should have its own criminal types which would be entirely or in the main different from the corresponding types of every other social system. But

while it is doubtless true that these types vary somewhat from one social system to another, yet it would be an error to carry this idea too far for the following reasons.

In the first place, certain acts are stigmatized as criminal under almost every social system. For example, murder is a crime in every civilized community. So that the persons who are prone to commit these acts are likely to become criminals in almost every community. Furthermore, as communities increase in similarity owing to the internationalization of culture, their legal and moral codes become more and more alike, and consequently their criminal types become more and more alike.

In the second place, inasmuch as the category of acts stigmatized as criminal is in most places rather extensive, it is difficult for any human being to live for any length of time without committing some of these acts. Consequently, in every community there is some criminality diffused throughout the public at large, so that the line of distinction between the criminal and the non-criminal classes is by no means hard and fast. But most persons do not become known and are not punished as criminals, either because they do not commit these acts with sufficient frequency to attract public notice, or because on account of their cleverness or for some other reason they are not caught.

In the third place, we have reason to believe that there are certain types of individuals who are

very likely to become criminals under any social system. Several types of human beings are prone to violate legal and moral conventions, whatever those conventions may be. In every community are to be found intractable, rebellious, and unadaptable persons who are sure to react against any form of social control. In this group it may be possible to discern a universal criminal type which is to be found in every community. Consequently, while the personnel of the criminal class at any time and place is determined in part by the kinds of acts which are criminal, it is also determined in part, and perhaps in large part, by the traits of this universal criminal type.

We can now discern more clearly several considerations which must never be forgotten when studying the criminal class at any specific time and place. In the first place, it must always be borne in mind that the distinction between the criminal and the non-criminal classes is by no means a hard and fast one. In the second place, it is doubtless true that the kinds of acts which are stigmatized as criminal will determine in part what individuals are to become criminal. For example, at a time when crimes against the person are rigorously pursued by the law, the individuals who are prone to commit acts of violence against their fellow beings are likely to become criminals. But, in the third place, it is probably true, as I have already stated, that certain peculiarities can be distinguished of those who are

criminal at all times and places. There are several types of persons who are always peculiarly prone to violate the legal and moral conventions which determine what acts are criminal. It is evident that the last condition limits the preceding one, and that the criminal class at any time is determined in part by what acts are criminal, but perhaps in larger part by traits which are more or less universally characteristic of this class.

I have already stated earlier in this chapter that the elementary traits of human nature are the fundamental factors in the determination of criminal conduct, as of every other kind of conduct. No one of these traits alone causes this conduct. For example, there is no distinct instinct of crime which makes human beings commit crimes. Nor are there any instincts which invariably or almost always lead to crime. On the contrary, any instinct may under certain conditions lead to crime, while under other conditions it may lead to conduct having great social utility. The instincts are the product of a long process of evolution, and came into existence long before the laws which designate the crimes of today. Furthermore, these laws have not been devised by psychologists who were acquainted with the human instincts and wished to restrain some of them. On the contrary, they have been devised by men who usually have known nothing whatever about human psychology, but have wanted to prevent certain kinds of conduct which they believe to be

socially harmful. Hence it is inaccurate to speak of a criminal instinct, or of an instinctive type of criminal.

In similar fashion, there are no specifically criminal feelings, but any feeling may under certain conditions lead to criminal conduct, while under other conditions it may impel towards socially useful conduct. As for the intelligence, when viewed by itself it is entirely unmoral in character. It acquires moral significance only in connection with the sort of conduct it happens to direct. In some circumstances it may direct instincts and emotions towards criminal conduct, and in other circumstances towards non-criminal conduct. But the influence of the intelligence is probably on the whole against crime, because it enables the individual to understand the need and justification for social control, and thus makes him more prone to heed the law.

There are, therefore, no peculiar crime factors in human nature. As a matter of fact, criminal conduct frequently results from the unusual strength of certain normal traits, or from the unusual weakness of certain restraining factors in human nature. Every human being has in him the making of a criminal. There are no saints, despite the canonizations of the church. In every one are to be found the emotions of anger and of jealousy which frequently lead to murder, the sexual passion which sometimes leads to sexual crimes, the germ of avarice which leads to various crimes against property, the love of pleasure and

the lack of foresight which in their extreme forms lead to various kinds of criminal conduct. In fact, if any human trait is born in a person in unusual strength, or is developed to an unusual degree in the course of the lifetime of the individual, or is stimulated to an excessive degree under unusual circumstances, it may lead to criminal conduct. In similar fashion, if some of the restraining factors in human nature are congenitally weak, or if they are not fully developed during the lifetime of the individual, or if they are weakened or inhibited under unusual circumstances, some of the normal traits may not be prevented from causing criminal conduct.

These facts indicate that no persons are born criminal in the sense that they are criminal at birth, or predestined at the time of their birth to become criminal. It is, however, convenient frequently to speak of several of these types of persons born with abnormal traits, which are very likely to lead them into criminal conduct, as being congenitally criminal. Criminal conduct is, therefore, like every other kind of conduct, the outcome of the co-operation of these internal factors in the determination of human behavior with the forces of the environment. In order to understand the criminality of criminals it is necessary to study both these internal factors and the external environmental factors.

§ 6.—CRIME AND SOCIAL CHANGES.

Crime as a social phenomenon will continue to

change as long as society changes. These changes will be both in the nature and extent of crime. New social conditions create new occasions for conflict between individual and social interests, while obsolete causes of conflict disappear with changing conditions. The increase or decrease of crime therefore depends upon the proportion between the new and the old causes of crime.

While civilization has destroyed many causes of crime, the advance of civilization has created some new occasions for conflict, and has therefore increased crime in some ways, though it is impossible to ascertain whether it has increased it on the whole. It is possible that civilization will continue to increase crime for a time. For example, the tremendous growth of cities in modern times has been a powerful factor for the increase of crime, and urban growth will doubtless continue for a time at least. The continual rise of moral standards will always be adding new forms of conduct to the list of crimes, though it will also be removing other forms of conduct hitherto stigmatized as criminal in the penal code.

The diminution of crime will depend somewhat upon the growth of population and the consequent bitterness of the struggle for existence. If population increases too rapidly, this struggle will be intensified, and there can be little hope of a decrease of crime. But if the growth of population is regulated, so that the population will not increase too rapidly, the

conditions of human existence will be ameliorated, and crime will probably diminish. This fact indicates the supreme importance for the prevention of crime of the intelligent use of birth control measures, which are now blindly and indiscriminately prohibited by laws of many countries.

§ 7.—THE PREVENTION OF CRIME DEPENDENT UPON THE PREVENTION OF OTHER SOCIAL EVILS.

Crime can never be entirely abolished. However ideal social conditions may become, certain human traits which give rise to anti-social acts can never be eradicated. Among these traits are selfishness, greed, anger, jealousy, vindictiveness, envy, etc.

It is nevertheless worth while to consider the problem of the prevention of crime. Economic and political reorganization will doubtless lessen crime in the long run. If a socialistic scheme of social organization proves successful, it may obviate some of the crimes against property. An increase in the efficiency of government will prevent some of the crimes against the person. But even if no thoroughgoing reorganization of society ever takes place, there will doubtless be a certain amount of improvement in economic and political conditions which will diminish crime somewhat. The egregious inefficiency of the existing economic and political system will be remedied in part, and will thus render more effective the methods of dealing with crime.

The prevention of crime is dependent almost

entirely upon the prevention of other social evils, so that it is hardly possible to discuss it apart from those evils. For example, a program for the prevention of poverty involves a program for the prevention of many of the social evils which give rise to crime, because crime is closely bound up in its causation with poverty and its attendant evils. It is, therefore, impossible to devise a special program for the prevention of crime, and I shall merely point out how its prevention is related to the prevention of these other evils and to the reorganization of society in general.

The instability of the existing economic organization is illustrated by the trade cycle which causes a vast amount of unemployment and violent fluctuations in prices and wages. In this fashion the fundamental material basis of existence of a large part of society is rendered uncertain, and a good deal of economic pressure to commit criminal acts is created. The excessive inequality in the distribution of wealth is reflected in the great disparity between the criminality of the poor and of the wealthy classes.

The economic pressure also acts upon many persons who are not destitute, but who desire a higher standard of living. Many of the weaker individuals, and some of the stronger ones as well, yield to the temptation to commit criminal acts in order to attain their desires. All of these facts indicate that the prevention of crime does not depend upon special measures for the abolition of its specific causes, but

upon a more or less thorough reorganization of the economic system.

At the same time our comprehensive survey of the causes of crime has indicated how essential it is in the study of the etiology of crime to keep in mind the individual factors, as well as the economic and other social factors. Many writers have committed the grave error of going to the one or to the other of these two extremes in formulating their theories. Among those who have laid excessive emphasis upon the economic factors are the socialists who have attributed most crimes to the economic organization of society, and have contended that under a socialist organization there would be very little crime. In similar fashion, the single taxers have blamed most crimes upon the present economic organization, and have asserted that the single tax would prevent most of them. Some of the anarchists have taken a similar view with respect to the present situation, but have contended that the abolition of all political organizations would be the most effective preventive of crime. A number of sentimentalists without any definite program have attributed most crimes to economic factors because they have been unwilling to blame them upon the criminals themselves.

On the other hand, there have been many persons who have given excessive weight to the individual factors in the causation of crime. Among these have been some religious writers who have apparently wanted to emphasize the sinfulness and personal

responsibility of criminals because they believe in the existence of a free will. But probably the majority of those who have taken this view have done so for conservative reasons, because they did not want to blame crimes upon the existing order, which they want to preserve.

There have also been a few criminal anthropologists and psychiatrists who have become so obsessed with the pathological and abnormal traits of the criminal class that they have been able to see few of the factors outside of the individuals. They have therefore given undue weight to the individual factors for crime.

Excessive emphasis upon the individual factors in criminality has led some persons to the belief that eugenic measures can prevent crime entirely or in large part. These measures may eliminate some of the feebleminded and psychopathic criminals. But it is obvious that it cannot remove the powerful criminogenic factors in the environment.

§ 8.—THE NORMAL LIFE AS A PREVENTIVE OF CRIME.

In the last analysis, it may be said that crime will disappear to the extent to which the normal life becomes possible for mankind. By the normal life I mean the spontaneous expression of human nature. In any organized society this spontaneity must be limited by at least a small amount of social control. But in the existing organization of society

this spontaneity is limited far more than is necessary for social welfare.

The prevention of poverty and other economic evils, and the abolition of the restrictions imposed by institutionalized religion, conventional morality, and antiquated repressive laws, would increase greatly the scope of the normal life for human beings, and would obviate to a corresponding degree the occasions for anti-social conduct. So that the great forces of science and of statesmanship in our civilization should be directed towards attaining the highest goal of social progress which will render the normal life more feasible for all of mankind.

Hence it is that the problem of crime is a problem of human freedom as well as of repression. It is to a considerable extent a problem of liberating mankind from the bonds which fetter body and mind and which interfere with the development of a full and well-rounded human personality.

CHAPTER V

PROSTITUTION

§ 1.—DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF THE TERM

In the endeavor to arrive at an accurate definition of prostitution no little effort has been expended. Different conceptions are possible from different points of view. The European police define prostitution from the standpoint of registration or inscription: as a rule they register or, where the system has been discontinued, used to register, only professional prostitutes,—women, that is, who have no other means of support than prostitution. From the police point of view the prostitute is therefore an inscribed woman, or a woman who, somehow eluding inscription, ought to be inscribed, or one who is at any rate liable to inscription, on the ground that she earns her livelihood through sexual promiscuity. Vast numbers, however, escape through the wide meshes of this net. Many prostitutes are actually engaged in some sort of remunerative work. The barmaids of the German “*Animierkneipe*,”¹ the singers and dancers of low grade Variétés are prostitutes who obtain their customers by means of their occupations; yet

1. The *Animierkneipe* is a low-grade drinking-resort in which the barmaids drink with her customer, often in a screened nook or corner, if he can be induced to occupy one.

they are usually exempt from inscription as professional prostitutes because gainfully employed, and being exempt from inscription they fall outside the police definition of professional prostitution. The mere fact that partial or even pretended employment is a protection against police interference leads many prostitutes to keep up a more or less nominal connection with work. It is therefore obvious that the police definition fails to square with the facts. Parent-Duchatelet, following an official declaration, uses the term prostitution, where "several mercenary acts of immorality have been legally established, when the woman involved is publicly notorious, when she has been caught in the act by other witnesses than her accuser or the police agent."¹ From this definition, however, all really clandestine prostitution is quite omitted; it suffices only for the most obvious and necessary police purposes. By way of contrast with the narrow conceptions above given, I shall, for reasons that will shortly appear, consider prostitution to be characterized by three elements variously combined: barter, promiscuity, emotional indifference. The barter need not involve the passing of money, though money is its usual medium; gifts or pleasures may be the equivalent inducement. Nor need promiscuity be utterly choiceless; a woman is not the less a prostitute because she is more or less selective in her associations. Emotional indifference may be

¹ A. J. B. Parent-Duchatelet, *De la Prostitution dans la Ville de Paris*, Vol. I, p. 25.

fairly inferred from barter and promiscuity. In this sense, any person is a prostitute who habitually or intermittently has sexual relations more or less promiscuously for money or other mercenary consideration. Neither notoriety, arrest, nor lack of other occupation is an essential criterion. A woman may be a prostitute, even though not notorious, even though never arrested, even though simultaneously otherwise employed in a paid occupation.

The scope of the term is thus greatly, and, as I hope to show, justifiably, nay, necessarily, extended. Barter, emotional indifference, and more or less promiscuity do not in modern cities characterize the sex relations of the avowed or professional prostitute alone. They are equally characteristic marks of the clandestine prostitute, using the term in its literal meaning to designate the numerous classes of professional prostitutes whose real character is known only to their own clientele and their close female companions; of the occasional prostitute,—women who alternately emerge from and relapse into an irregular life; of the incidental prostitute,—those who carry on more or less prostitution without interrupting some honorable employment; of women who practise prostitution under cloak of other occupations; of women who ceasing to be kept as mistresses practice prostitution as a stop-gap until a firmer footing is once more found; of women who reserve themselves by express arrangement for a small group, none of whom can alone afford their support; of women, who faithful

to one individual at a time are still taken up by a succession of men paying for favors; finally of married women, by no means always of the lowest classes, who, perhaps irreproachable in the eyes of the world, are not above earning through ignominy the price of luxuries. Here are eight different categories, falling outside the narrow conception of prostitution, but nevertheless belonging to prostitution, if prostitution is conceived to be characterized by barter, emotional indifference, and promiscuity.

§ 2.—OBJECTIONS TO PROSTITUTION

For this broad construction there exist the most substantial of grounds. Why do we object to prostitution at all? Obviously, it is repugnant for one or more of several reasons: in the first place, because of the personal demoralization it entails; in the second, because of economic waste; again, because it is by far the main factor in the spread of venereal disease; finally, because of its intimate association with disorder or crime. Unquestionably the full-time notorious prostitutes who are the especial objects of police care exemplify all the counts in this indictment; they are themselves demoralized and they spread demoralization; they cause enormous waste; they inevitably and invariably spread disease; as a rule they have criminal or quasi-criminal connections. But there could be no greater mistake than to suppose that the other categories above specified are free from objection on these scores.

Part-time prostitution, occasional prostitution, pretentious prostitution,—all the various kinds and grades above enumerated naturally and inevitably conduce to similar results. They may be less conspicuous or less offensive, but they are equally dangerous. If then prostitution is objectionable because of demoralization, waste, disease, or crime, then it is necessary so to define it as to include all the varieties to which one or more of the unfortunate results in question is attributable. The lowest forms are most closely connected with crime and disorder, and as the police are mainly concerned with crime and disorder, they content themselves with a working conception of prostitution that goes no further. But the general concern of society must regard as hardly less serious menaces to its highest welfare the personal demoralization, the economic loss, the spread of disease equally associated with the less gross forms of the evil. For these are attended by personal degradation, even though some individuals, on the whole a considerable number, ultimately react vigorously enough to recover their self-respect; and they involve enormous economic waste, increasing rather than diminishing with the degree of dignity with which the business is surrounded, so that what externally least resembles commercial prostitution is perhaps from the economic standpoint most severely to be reprobated as such.

It is, however, in respect to disease that the wide definition can be most readily and fully justified.

Venereal disease is the certain harvest of any degree of promiscuity in the sex relation. The diminution of venereal disease is one of the most pressing objects of hygienic effort; it can be accomplished only by some sort of interference with prostitution. It would therefore be absurd to define prostitution so narrowly that many of the regular foci of infection remain outside the definition and hence beyond the reach of any policy contrived for the purpose of dealing with them. How numerous the foci are which a narrow conception would thus ignore can not be fully shown in this book; but enough must be said in this connection to warrant the extention of the definition beyond the usual police lines. A statistical study of venereal disease at Mannheim covering nine years (1892-1901) showed that 63% of the infections were traceable to professional prostitutes in the narrow police sense of the term, no less than 37%, however, to the occasional, incidental, and other prostitutes here explicitly included in the term; among whom girls in active service as waitresses, servants, and shop-hands are the most important. A subsequent investigation of 594 cases disclosed 278 professionals and 316—over 50%—girls serving in one capacity or another (waitress, seamstress, laundress, actress, etc.) as the sources of infection. - A similar statistics from Hanover proves in the same way that it is from the standpoint of sanitation absurd to limit prostitution to the absolutely indiscriminate, professional and notorious activity:

of 330 women, to whom infections were traced, 42% (139) were outright professionals, though only partly inscribed, the remaining 58% being mainly girls who were simultaneously engaged in paid employments in shops, taverns, domestic service, theaters, etc. The Munich police have lately made a most careful study of the callings in which 2,574 clandestine prostitutes well known to them are simultaneously engaged: 721 are servants, 608 are waitresses, 250 factory workers, 246 seamstresses, 60 are connected with the stage, 52 are laundresses, 40 dressmakers, 28 models, etc. Similar results can be cited from other sources. Of 100 venereal patients at Rouen, only 31 of the infections could be traced to inscribed prostitutes; 69 cases were attributed to clandestines, partials, etc. Of 297 traceable infections in Stockholm, 146—practically one-half—were attributed to girls also engaged in work. The police of Hamburg are at any rate logical, for there girls employed in bars and fish-shops may be registered as prostitutes; in certain smaller North German cities prostitution is so commonly associated with employment as barmaid that the latter is practically merged with the former. The condition of barmaids and waitresses in many restaurants in Japan is no better. Under conditions in which barmaids, shop girls, servants, chorus-girls, etc., are either permanently or intermittently engaged in prostitution, and when so engaged bring about precisely the same sort of damage that is wrought by prostitutes who are nothing else, it

is manifestly illogical to use the term so as to designate the latter class only. The fact that complication with disorder attaches only to the lower types is assuredly no reason for restricting the designation of prostitution to them, once we realize that, on the score of personal demoralization, economic waste, and the danger of disease, the more sophisticated or subtle forms of commercialized immorality are equally dangerous and destructive. Prostitution will therefore in these pages be construed to mean more or less promiscuity—even transient promiscuity,—of sex relationship for pay, or its equivalent.

§ 3.—IRREGULAR SEX CONNECTIONS.

The definition just given is intended to exclude both immorality and unconventionality in the sex relation, though, for reasons that will appear, they require incidental discussion in an account of prostitution. Of these unconventional or irregular sex relationships there are many varieties, more or less widespread. Most substantial is the informal union which serves as a substitute for marriage. In these combinations mutual fidelity is expected, as well as complete responsibility for such children as may be born. A combination of this sort is occasionally permanent; occasionally it is converted into formal marriage; oftener, perhaps, it binds only during mutual congeniality, being dissolved when congeniality ceases, or more frequently when one or the other member has already entered on the stages preliminary to

another combination. In the city such informal mating of industrial workers of opposite sexes is frequent; the shop girl contracts an alliance of this kind with a clerk of her own class, or not infrequently with a student or professional man, more or less above her in rank. Of the non-legalized cohabitation of the artisans of London, Booth remarks that at times they behave best if not married to the women with whom they live; occasionally two parties to previous but unsuccessful matrimony pair off again without the intervention of the divorce court, and, as a rule, are faithful to each other. Somewhat similar is an informal relationship continued as such until a child is born—or shortly after—whereupon the neglected rites may be duly performed. The high percentage of illegitimacy in Japan is thus partly accounted for. The incident is so common among the lower classes, especially in some rural districts, as hardly to carry any stigma at all. In Germany a similar condition exists: In Berlin, it is reported, 20% of the births are outside of wedlock, and in all Germany, almost 10%.¹ "Frequent illegitimacy," writes Adele Schreiber, "may be the expression of wholesome monogamous conditions, as indeed is often the case in mountainous countries. Premarital relations are there common, are characterized by mutual fidelity and, with exceptions of course, look forward to marriage when a child is

¹ *Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich*—quoted by J. Marcuse: *Die Beschränkung der Geburtenzahl*, 1913, p. 22.

born and the parents are able to establish a home."¹ These relations must be distinguished from the episodic connection that is a mere incident in the course of casual companionship. Mainly in this latter sense, immoral relations before marriage among the lower classes are not unusual and are indulgently regarded. James Devon, describing Glasgow conditions, observes that girls do not seem to suffer in self-respect nor greatly in the esteem of others, if they yield themselves to the lad who is their sweetheart for the time. If decency is observed, morals are taken for granted. On the Continent these conditions also exist. "Extra-marital, especially pre-marital intercourse is everywhere in the country very frequent," declares Moll. Of certain communities in Saxony it has been deliberately asserted that "no girl over sixteen is still a virgin"; the German peasant is declared to have no conception of the meaning of chastity.² Welander dealing with 452 prostitutes who could give a clear account of their first lapse, found that 299 had erred while still living at home or before leaving the country to take a position in Stockholm.³

Episodic laxity unquestionably exposes the girl to dangers that readily result in prostitution, just as it develops in her comrade the appetite that leads him

¹ Wohlrabe: *Schäden und Gefahren der sexuellen Unsittlichkeit*, 1908, pp. 8—10.

² The author is a clergyman, and might have taken too unfavorable a view.

³ Zeitschrift, Vol. XI, p. 410.

to consort with prostitutes. But in itself mere laxity is not to be confused with prostitution. The instances above given show how widely immorality varies in ethical quality. An irregular sex relation may indicate only carelessness of the convention that restricts sexual congress to the married relation ; it may, at the other extreme, indicate total indifference to the ethical standard that forbids sexual commerce unaccompanied by high emotional sanction, mutual respect, complete responsibility for the natural result. The former is a marriage in all but form ; the latter is simple depravity ; but neither involves prostitution. A lapse—one or several—does not imply prostitution ; nor is the paid mistress a prostitute so long as her relations, emotionally indifferent and mercenary though they be, are free from promiscuity. It must be remembered, therefore, that irregular sex connection may not only lack bairer or promiscuity, but on the woman's side at least may possess high emotional coloring, whether she be mistress, unwedded wife, or compliant sweetheart.

§ 4—ECONOMIC LOSS CAUSED BY PROSTITUTION.

The cost of prostitution, near and remote, direct and indirect, outruns any calculation that one would dare to formulate. Payment for service varies from a few copper coins to several hundred marks or francs or dollars ; incidental expense for accommodations, amusements, liquor, gratuities, gifts, may double the immediate outlay. The Berlin street girl of fair grade

demands five or ten marks; with her customer she takes a cab or taxi, for which he pays; they resort to a hotel or room of which she has the use and for which he pays perhaps six marks more; she demands pin-money for herself, the maid or concierge. Money is the sole object of her effort, the whole burden of her talk. "The Berlin street-walker," writes Schneider, "immediately asks the stranger whom she accosts: 'what will you give me?' Once at home with her, the bargaining begins anew, for, now that she has him she can raise her demands." Impossible as it is to be definite, one fact stands out: the prostitute living at large is swindled by every one who has dealings with her: her landlord, by way of recompense for the legal risk he may run, the dressmaker, milliner, grocer, butcher, etc. The London street-walker pays three guineas in rental where an honest family pays one. Nor is her outlay limited to her own necessities, for she must earn enough to satisfy the rapacity of her pimp, besides. Her business interest and bad taste lead her to indulge in shoddy and relatively expensive luxuries, soon worn out or discarded. The price of all this, mere livelihood, extravagance, and rascality, her patrons pay; from them every sou is obtained.

In the long run, whatever the women earn, they rarely have anything to show for it. The bordello-keeper plies them hard and then manages to keep them in her debt. Despite the fact that they may entertain anywhere from five to fifty guests in twenty-

four hours, they do not own the clothes on their back, when they make up their mind to leave ! Schneider calculates the minimum payment of a girl for bare living in the better bordells of Hamburg, Leipzig, and Vienna at 300 to 600 marks a month—an underestimiate, as he himself subsequently avers. Seventy-five wretched creatures are harbored in the barracks of Helenenstrasse, Bremen, independently of each other ; several of them figured out the amount they must earn merely to live; from which it appeared that 10,000 marks a year each barely sufficed : the first charge for their support was therefore 750,000 marks !

I have spoken thus far only of the money immediately involved,—the sums paid to the prostitute for her service, the sums paid out by her for her keep. But the account is not so simple. We may not overlook the loss involved in the unproductiveness of this army of women ; expenditure on alcohol, gifts and demoralizing amusements ; the long score chargeable to venereal disease, including the loss in earnings, the outlay for treatment, both or the immediate victims and those still more unfortunate on whom, though innocent, some part of the curse and its cost not infrequently devolves. Upwards of 10,000 individuals are now annually treated for venereal complaints in the public hospitals of Berlin alone. These are essential items in the cost of prostitution. Of the total loss only the roughest guesses can be made; but it is worth noting that

any estimate that endeavors to include all the factors, direct and indirect, soon reaches into the millions. Losch, for example, has reckoned the annual cost of prostitution to the German Empire at something between 300 and 500 million marks. This outlay may be contrasted with that spent by the Prussian Government on its entire educational system: its universities, secondary schools, elementary school system, technical and professional institutions of all kinds involving a budget in 1909 of a little less than 200,000,000 marks. Assuredly the economic burden imposed on society by prostitution is comparable with that due to standing armies, war, or pestilence.

§ 5.—ECONOMIC CAUSE OF PROSTITUTION.

Investigators frequently assert that the chief cause of prostitution is poverty, and that it is due to the low wages of women or to the sudden depression in trade. Prostitutes are mainly derived from the ranks of factory girls, domestic servants, shop girls, and waitresses. In some of these occupations it is difficult to get work all the year around. We need only to consider the miserable wages earned by the greater number of working women, upon which it is impossible to exist, the recipients being forced to eke out their livelihood by prostitution. Further than this, some employers are infamous enough to excuse the lowness of the salaries by pointing out this means of indemnification.

Perhaps the great majority of proletarian women have become prostitutes to escape the joyless life of the working woman, animated by the urgent desire for fine clothes, the theater and an existence which appears brighter and more desirable than the life of the ordinary proletarian who lives simply by hard labor. It is estimated that from forty to fifty per cent. are recruited from the servant class.

There is another large group of girls falling victims to prostitution from the lack of a proper home and the conditions of home life, but the great majority of prostitutes enter their profession as the direct result of economic pressure. It is a fact of common observation that where women's wages rise, prostitution diminishes to a proportionate degree, and conversely with a fall of women's wages, not only does there result an increase in the number of prostitutes, but, further, as a necessary result of the increasing competition, the market price of the prostitute's service falls.

§ 6.—THE BIOLOGIC FACTOR OF PROSTITUTION.

Lombroso has more especially advocated the doctrine that prostitution is the vicarious equivalent of criminality. In this he was developing the results taught by the important study of the Jukes family by Dugale, who found that where the brothers committed crime, the sisters adopted prostitution. The fines and imprisonments of the women of the family were not for violations of the rights of pro-

perty, but mainly for offences against public decency. The psychologic as well as the anatomic identity of the criminal and born prostitute, Lombroso and Ferrero concluded, could not be more complete; both are identical with the moral insane and therefore, according to the axiom, equal to each other. There is the same lack of moral sense, the same hardness of heart, the same precocious taste for evil, the same indifference to social infamy, the same volatility, love of idleness, and lack of foresight. The same taste for fancied pleasures, for the orgy and for alcohol, the same or almost the same vanity. "Prostitution is only the feminine side of criminality. The prostitute is therefore psychologically criminal."

It would therefore seem on the whole, so far as the evidence goes, that prostitutes are not quite normal representatives of the ranks in which they were born.

§ 7.—MAN'S PHYSIOLOGICAL NECESSITY.

Science has completely and absolutely proven the falsity of that dogma of the Middle Ages. Forel says: "It is this modern arsenal of prostitution which plays the principal rôle. In this way the sexual appetite is not only artificially increased, and often directed into unnatural channels, but it also leads to the poison and ruin of youth by venereal diseases, to say nothing of alcoholism.

"Immoderate sexual desire, provoked in men by

artificial excitations of prostitution, etc., is a bad acquisition. It renders difficult the inclination to marriage, fidelity and life-long love for the same woman. The degradation of the sexual sentiments of a man who has long been accustomed to live with prostitutes is never entirely effaced, and generally leaves an indelible impression on the human brain."

Westermarck points out that the more advanced is civilization, the greater is the number of illegitimate births, and the more widespread is prostitution. In Europe the proportion of illegitimate children and of prostitutes is nearly double in the towns what it is in the country. This shows, he says, the absurdity of regarding promiscuity as a primitive state. On the contrary, it is the rotten fruit of civilization and more especially of semi-civilization. Primitive customs are generally chaste and it is civilization which corrupts them. In Europe prostitution is becoming more frequent while marriage is becoming less frequent. It is the latter which constitutes the primitive and natural state.

§ 8.—THE CIVILIZATION VALUE OF PROSTITUTION.

Prostitution has been considered a buttress to our marriage system. That was the assumption of the pagan philosophers of Greece and Rome and of the early Christian fathers. That this premise is not only wholly false, but that, further, prostitution does and always has undermined the very social fabric

and foundation of the home, has been proven by the cold logic of science. Havelock Ellis says: "The attraction of the prostitute by no means ceases when men are married, for a larger number, if not the majority, of those who visit prostitutes are married men."

Marriage represents the sexual life of one-half of the bourgeois world and prostitution represents the other. When men for one reason or another remain unmarried, they generally resort to prostitution; and again, when a man finds no satisfaction in married life, it is to prostitution that he resorts. Provision is thus made for men celibates as well as for men whose marriage has been a disappointment.

It is not merely the general conditions or civilization, but more specifically the conditions of urban life, which make the factor insistent. On the one hand, urban life, by the stress of competition which it imposes, causes a severe, exacting routine of dull work, while at the same time it makes men and women more sensitive to new impressions, more enamored of excitement and change. It multiplies the opportunities for social intercourse; it decreases the chances of detection of illegitimate intercourse; while at the same time it makes marriage more difficult, for by heightening social ambition and the increased cost of living, it postpones the time when a home can be created.

It thus results from the social conditions of to-day that among the men of the possessing classes a

considerable number renounce monogamic marriage altogether. Others if they marry do not live monogamically, and finally, in the best of cases, they do not become monogamists until they have had ten years or more of extra-conjugal life. It results that there are a large number of men in the full vigor of sexual maturity who believe themselves to need opportunities for extrosexual intercourse.

¶ 9.—MASCULINE UNCHASTITY AND THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALS.

While, as we have already seen, there are many auxiliary causes of prostitution, the whole history of this infamous institution, from the time it was legalized in ancient Greece, side by side with or rather because of the institution of monogamous marriage, to the present day, shows that it was based on the polygamous proclivities and practices of the male, which lead him to seek the gratification of his sexual instinct whenever and wherever he could find a receptive partner.

Undoubtedly the chief contributory cause is that false social code of morals, diametrically opposed to the moral code taught by Christianity, which readily condones in the man what it unsparingly condemns in the woman, extenuating or accepting as excusable in the one what it decrees to be unpardonable in the other.

It is by no means intended to say that all men are bad and that all women are good; nothing

could be more false than such a statement. Nor is the sexual appetite in women any such negligible quantity as it is so often wrongly represented to be. Through centuries of time, custom and tradition, and the social ostracism of the woman who forgets her obligations to the standards of good society the average woman has her sexual impulses under fairly good control. As a rule the woman owes her fall to the aggressive solicitations or seductions of the man, and very often she yields because of a sentimental feeling from the man's statement: "You are the only one who can save me from perdition." After the first step the descent to a life of shame is easy and almost inevitable.

The influence of this false code of morality is reflected in the conventional standards of society, which freely opens its doors to the chartered libertine and bars and bolts them against his victim. Women are the most pitiless and unrelenting in their ostracism of those of their sex who have crossed the Rubicon of virtue. The virtuous matron who would shield her daughter from all contact with a fallen sister as contaminating, with the most indulgent charity smiles upon the very man who may have been the author of her ruin. She may indeed receive him as a suitor for her daughter if he is otherwise eligible.

The father of a family may welcome to the society of his wife and daughters men whom he knows lead dissipated lives and frequent the comp-

any of immoral women. The father may even pay a bonus in the shape of a large dowry to pay the debts the man has incurred in keeping a mistress; too often the daughter is compelled to share in the discharge of the debt he has contracted to disease.

As the result of this double standard of morality, society separates its women, as did the Greeks of old, into two classes. From the one it demands chastity and the other is set apart for the gratification of the sexual caprices of men. The great gulf fixed between virtuous and immoral women is bridged over by social convention which permits men to pass and repass freely, but the prostitute is not without her revenge, for the man carries to his chaste wife the germs of the deadly venereal diseases.

CHAPTER VI

VENEREAL DISEASES

The so-called social diseases are extended through society largely through prostitution. They are exceedingly communicable and insidious, and men and women who lead impure lives sexually are certain to be infected with them sooner or later. It is difficult to get statistics that are reliable, but even conservative physicians have estimated that fully one-eighth of the diseases which afflict humanity come from unclean sexual life.

§ I.—GONORRHOEA.

Syphilis is the most obviously appalling of the venereal diseases, yet it is less frequent and in some respects less dangerously insidious than the other chief venereal disease, gonorrhoea. The inflammatory results of gonorrhoea are indubitably a most potent cause of sterility in both sexes. Some authorities have stated that not only eighty per cent. of the deaths from inflammatory diseases of the pelvic organs and the majority of the cases of chronic invalidism in women, but the great majority of involuntary sterile marriages, are due to gonorrhoea. Very much of the blindness of infants is due to the same cause.

Gonorrhoea has for its sole etiologic factor the

gonococcus. In woman the source of this contagion in the vast majority of cases is a latent or chronic gonorrhœa in the man. In man the infection is almost always superficial, while in woman the infection is more often primarily located in the deep parts, which is explained by the physiology of coitus, the germs being deposited at the uterine neck.

In the woman the infection ordinarily remains localized in its primary seat without extension to the neighboring points, until some exciting influence such as sexual excess, the congestion due to menstruation, or pregnancy, determines an extension of the process. The auto-infection may radiate in both directions, but most frequently it takes an ascending course. The gonococci, invading the lining membrane of the uterus, pass upward through the continuity of tissues to the tubes, ovaries, and peritoneum. In the majority of cases the infection is established insidiously without acute symptoms, so that as a rule gonorrhœa in woman is not seen until it has become a chronic affection.

Pregnancy, which may result in abortion or in accouchement at full term, constitutes the greatest conceivable danger to women with gonorrhœa of the neck of the uterus. The condition to which many women ardently aspire in the fulfilment of their hopes of maternity, thus becomes the instrument of their destruction. The hour to which the woman looks forward as the termination of her pains and

confinement is but the beginning of a long period of suffering, grave danger, and not infrequently death.

When a woman infected with gonorrhoea becomes pregnant, the disease which has hitherto remained passive is apt to undergo a more or less marked virulent modification. Abortion and accouchement create the opportunity which permits this infection, now revived into virulence, to pass through the tubes, ovaries, and peritoneum, determining the grave consequences which follow profound infection.

In the vast majority of cases pregnancy is the pivot upon which hangs the destiny of the woman, so far as the extension of the infection is concerned, because the process of parturition communicates the pathologic impulse. Not only are the gonococci multiplied in numbers and exalted in virulence, the way being opened for ascending infection, but the soil is prepared in the process of parturition by the anatomic changes which take place in the uterus. After accouchement the tissues of the genital organs are in a peculiar state of imbibition, infiltration, and succulence; the uterine orifices are enlarged, the mucous membrane is in part desquamated, and the glandular culdesacs persist, offering to the gonococcus a favorable soil for its proliferation.

2—2 SYPHILIS.

Syphilis is a contagious, constitutional disease due to a germ, the *Spirocheta pallida*, which was discovered in 1905. The origin of the disease is

uncertain. That it was unknown to Europe until the return of Columbus and his sailors, who brought it back with them from the island of Haiti, causing a blasting epidemic to spread over and devastate Spain, Italy, France, and England, is highly improbable. Invading armies, always a frightful means of spreading disease, carried syphilis with them everywhere, leaving it to rage unchecked among the natives when the armies went down to destruction or defeat. It has been estimated that at the present time there is not a single race or people upon whom syphilis has not set its mark.

According to the figures given by Stokes it is believed to be five times as frequent in men as women. Blaschko, while apparently extreme, cannot be lightly dismissed when he places the percentage of syphilis in clerks and merchants in Berlin between the ages of 18 and 28, as 45 per cent. Pinkus estimated that one man in every five in Germany had syphilis.

Recently published Statistics by Vedder, covering the condition of recruits drawn to the army in the United States from the city and country, estimated 20 per cent. to be syphilitic who apply for enlistment and 5 per cent. of the young men who enter the colleges. The percentage of syphilis in any class grouped by age increases with the age, since so few of the cases are cured and the number is simply added to up to a certain point, as time elapses. Even the army, representing in many

ways a filtered group of men passing vigorous examinations and protected by an elaborate system of prevention, which probably keeps the infection rate far below that of the civil population, is conceded by careful observers (Nichols and others) to show from 5 per cent. to 7 per cent. syphilitics.

Attention should be called to the difference in a population and the percentage of venereal diseases, including gonorrhoea, which increases the percentage enormously, since it is estimated that as high as 70 per cent. of adult males have gonorrhoea at least once in a lifetime. On the whole it is conservative to estimate that one man in every ten has syphilis.

The so-called Wassermann reaction was discovered in 1904. When the Wassermann test shows the presence of syphilis, it is called "positive;" before the infection has spread this test is negative. In about 20 to 30 per cent. of syphilitic individuals the test returns to the negative after the secondary stage is passed. This does not necessarily mean that the person is cured. If we wish to be sure of cure the treatment must be continued not only till the test becomes negative, but until it stays negative. This usually means repeated tests over a period of several years in connection with a course of treatment.

The discovery of salvarsan ("606"), which is a medical compound used in the modern treatment of syphilis, was announced to the world by its brilliant discoverer Paul Ehrlich, in 1910.

Trifling relapses, highly contagious sores in the mouth, or elsewhere are, in the first five years of an imperfectly treated infection, a very terrible danger to which thousands fall victim every year. Dangerous syphilis is improperly treated syphilis, and at any moment it may come into our drawing rooms, in the swimming pool, across the counter of the shop, or by way of the milkman, the waitress, or the barber. It confronts thousands of wives and children in the person of the half-cured father, infected nurse maids and others intimately associated with their personal lives. These dangers can be effectively removed from our midst by the substitution of radical for symptomatic methods. A person under vigorous treatment, with a view to a radical cure, is under the constant observation of his physician, and is nearly harmless. In a reasonable time he can be made fit even for marriage. In the fully developed infection in the second stage, three years is the minium, four years the average, and five years, treatment and observation are not uncommon.

§ 3.—SYPHILIS AND MARRIAGE.

As the product of experience it is a safe general rule to consider a person with untreated syphilis as decidedly infectious for the first three years of his disease and somewhat so for two years longer. Keyes on the basis of his private records made the estimate of the risk of infecting the wife. The chances taken by a syphilitic husband who used no

special precautions to prevent the infection of his wife were twelve to one in the first year in favor of an infection; five to two in the second year; and one to four in the third year, being negligible after the fourth year.

Hoffman says no treatment can guarantee the non-infectiousness of a syphilitic in the first five years of his disease. Time is thus an essential element in pronouncing a person non-infectious and hence in deciding his future for marriage.

Unlike gonorrhoea, which as we saw was apt to make women sterile, syphilis does not in most cases reduce the power to conceive. A woman with active syphilis may conceive with great frequency, but she cannot carry her children through to normal birth. In other words she usually has a series of miscarriages or abortions, in which she loses the child any time from the first to the eighth month. The series of abortions may be followed by still-births or syphilitic children.

More than 75 per cent. of children born with syphilis die within the first year of life and more than 95 per cent. of the children when untreated die. The moral effect of the loss or crippling of the new-born jars the character and morale of the parents to its very foundation. The toll of syphilis in misery and desolation, heart-breaks, broken bonds, and defeated ideals can never be estimated.

Kisses, caresses, and sexual relations make up the origin of an overwhelming proportion of syphilitic

infections. It is through these sources of contact that syphilis invades the family especially. Many a syphilitic who realizes that he should not have sexual relations with his wife while he has the disease in an active form will thoughtlessly infect her or his children in kissing. Kissing games are potentially dangerous. It is no great rarity to find that syphilis is dated from a sore on the lip that developed while a young couple were engaged. Certainly the indiscriminate kissing of strangers is as dangerous an indulgence as can be imagined. The combination of a cold sore or crack on the lips of the one and a mucous patch inside the lips of the other brings disaster very near. Children are sometimes the victim of this sort of thing, and it should be resented as an insult for a stranger to attempt to kiss another's child, no matter on what part of the body.

The sexual transmission of syphilis is beyond doubt the most important factor in the spread of this disease. Here all of the essential conditions for giving the germs a foothold in the body are satisfied. It is remarkable that trifling lesions can harbor them by the millions and how completely, especially in the case of women, syphilitic persons may be ignorant of the dangers to others. The sexual transmission of syphilis is a physiologic fact. A chancre acquired from a drinking cup or a pipe may be transmitted to husband or wife through a mucous patch on the genitals and to the children

through an infected mother, without the question of innocence or guilt ever having arisen. Fournier believes that 20 per cent. of syphilis in women is contracted in marriage, but according to Stokes 50 per cent. seems nearer the truth.

The man who has conformed to the best practice in both particulars of the time-principle treatment and the five-year rule, however, may usually marry and have healthy children. The woman under the same circumstances need not fear that the risk of having offspring injured by her disease is any greater than the risks that they will be injured in any of the ways that occur in bringing a child into the world.

§ 4.—SYPHILIS AND ENGAGEMENTS TO MARRY.

If a five-year rule is to be applied to marriage as was above stated, a similar rule should cover the engagement of a syphilitic to marry and it should cover the sexual relation of married people who acquire syphilis. It is not too much to expect that an engaged person who acquires syphilis shall break his engagement and not renew it or contract another until, by the five-year rule, he would be able to marry with safety.

Engagements nowadays may well be thought of as the equivalent of marriage in regard to the question of syphilis. "It is not infrequent" says Stokes, "that a man infected elsewhere with syphilis, unwittingly infects his fiancée through a

subsequent kiss." The publication of the banns before marriage is worth while, and an unmistakable testimony as to character and health of the parties concerned might be exchanged before a wooing is permitted to assume the character of an engagement. A medical examination, including a Wassermann test by an expert on syphilis, should be demanded. There should be a law to enforce this.

The problem of the relation of syphilis and marriage is simply an aspect of the transmission of an infectious disease. The infection of one party to the marriage by the other and the transmission of that infection to the children summarizes the social problem. Through the intimate contacts of family life syphilis attacks the future of the human race. The problem of syphilis in regard to marriage is a very serious one. It will never be completely met except by a vigorous public program against syphilis as a sanitary problem.

§ 5.—SYPHILIS AND PROSTITUTION.

The prevalence of syphilis among women who receive promiscuous attention is enormous. It is practically an axiom that no woman who is lax in her relations with men is safe from the danger of the disease, or can long remain free from it. The type of man who is a "light o' love" does not go far before he meets the partner who has been infected by someone else. Becoming infected himself, he passes his infection on to his next partner.

The acquiring of syphilis from loose men or women is usually thought of as an affair of genital contact. Yet it is notable that extragenital chancres are not uncommon results of liberties taken with light women which do not go to the extent of the sexual relation.

Of actual prostitutes, from 80 per cent. to 85 per cent. at some time during their career acquire syphilis. The recently published investigation of the Baltimore Vice Commission of the United States showed that 63 per cent. of 289 prostitutes examined by the wassermann test had syphilis, and of 266 examined, 92.1 per cent. had gonorrhœa. Nearly half of the girls examined had both diseases. About half the number are apt to have an active evidence of the disease.

Thirty per cent. examined by Papee in Lemberg were in the most dangerous period, the first to the third year of the disease. Three-fourths of these cases were in women under 25 years of age, in the most attractive period of their lives. Averaging a large number of European cities, it was found that not more than 40 per cent. of prostitutes were even free from the outward sign of syphilis, to say nothing of the laboratory tests. It is more than evident that prostitution is admirably fitted to play the leading rôle in the dissemination of this disease. The young and attractive prostitute is the one that draws the largest number, with the almost certain prospect of infecting them.

§ 6.—SYPHILIS AND DIVORCE.

The influential motive which prompts many men and most women to enter into matrimony is the pursuit of happiness. They expect to realize the fruition of their hopes in the intimate companionship and association of marriage, which this relation permits. Syphilis introduced into marriage often strikes the death knell of such hopes; it is destructive of the mutual love and esteem which should form the basis of marriage. Syphilis distils a double venom ; it poisons not only the health but the happiness of the household. It carries in its train not only physical woes but social misery, often divorce. What husband can hope to retain the esteem and love of the wife whom he has dishonored with a shameful disease, of the mother in whose child he has infused the foul taint of the prostitute, which dies before being born or comes into the world an object of disgust and horror? If he be a man of consciousness and sensibility, what remorse must he suffer from his sense of guilty responsibility for the ruin he has wrought !

The husband who has sent his young wife to a premature grave because he had not sufficient self-control to remain faithful to her in marriage and infected her with an acute gonorrhœa during pregnancy, is struck dumb with horror as he looks on her in her casket. Another, whose wife was driven insane by the knowledge that she had acquired syphilis from her husband, prated of suicide. *Cui*

bono? The tragedy of life is that we cannot go back and undo our mistakes and deadly sins.

We may now inquire what redress the law affords a woman who has been infected by her husband in the marriage relation.

The communication of syphilis in married life by one partner to the other, or even the exposure of one partner to the contagion of disease may affect: (1) contracts to marry; (2) annulment of the union; and (3) divorce.

In the first place it may be observed that the mere existence of venereal disease in one partner, or even its communication to the other, does not *per se* constitute a sufficient ground for divorce. There must be certain concurrent conditions of an aggravating character presently to be considered.

While syphilis is not specifically mentioned as a cause for divorce on the statute books in many countries, actions for divorce may be instituted on the grounds of "cruelty," as it is generally held by the American and English courts that the communication of this disease constitutes cruelty, which is a statutory ground for divorce. The French courts provide that one partner may demand divorce from the other on the ground of "grave injury," and since the communication of syphilis is held to be a grave injury, proceedings for divorce are usually instituted upon this ground or upon the ground of infidelity. We have no protection of this sort for women in Japan as yet, and they are left at the

mercy of their husbands in regard to the divorce problem.

§ 7.—PUBLIC EFFORTS AGAINST THE VENEREAL DISEASES.

A campaign against tuberculosis was the starting point to control tuberculosis, and in the same way a campaign has been at the bottom of the movement against venereal diseases which is now making headway at a great pace in most civilized countries. This country, however, is at the present time probably in the rear of any other great nations in the world in its efforts to control venereal diseases as a national problem. The way has been paved by the epoch-making movements of the Scandinavian countries and by the studies of the Sydenham Royal Commission, on whose findings the British Government has launched the greatest single movement against syphilis and gonorrhoea that has ever been undertaken.

CHAPTER VII

EUGENICS

The eugenic movement has by this time become so well known that it is hardly necessary to define eugenics. As a science it is a hybrid, because, while it consists largely of biology, it also contains a certain amount of sociology. As an art it is a branch of social politics or social technology, in which the principles and data of science are applied to society.

Two branches of eugenics are usually distinguished, namely, positive eugenics and negative eugenics. Positive eugenics is directed towards the encouragement of desirable births, while negative eugenics is directed towards the discouragement of undesirable procreation. Let us consider the principal measures which have been proposed in both of these branches of eugenics.

§ 1.—NEGATIVE EUGENICS.

Negative eugenics is based upon the assumption that certain human types are undesirable in society, and that it is known which individuals are certain or likely to give birth to progeny which belong to these types. Negative eugenic measures are therefore directed towards preventing these individuals from procreating. The first step toward doing so

usually is to prohibit these individuals, or rather the classes to which they belong, from marrying. But it is obvious that this measure alone cannot be at all successful from the eugenic point of view, and may indeed make matters much worse. Prohibition of marriage is certain to promote illegitimate matings among these individuals, and such matings may result in nearly if not quite as many offspring as if these matings had been legalized. Since these offspring would suffer from the stigma of bastardy, the situation would, if anything, be worse than it would be without such prohibitions upon marriage.

Two methods have therefore been advocated and applied to a certain extent to enforce these prohibitions. One method is custodial restraint, either in the extreme form of more or less complete segregation, or in the form of a careful and watchful guardianship. The other method is to render these individuals physiologically incapable of procreation, either by means of castration, or by making them sterile without castration.

§ 2.—POSITIVE EUGENICS.

Positive eugenics is based upon the assumption that certain human types are desirable in society, and that it is known what individuals are certain or likely to give birth to progeny which belong to these types. Positive eugenic measures are therefore directed towards encouraging these individuals to procreate. It is evident that positive eugenic mea-

sures cannot be as direct as negative eugenic measures, since it is hardly possible to force individuals to procreate, though it may be possible to prevent them by force from doing so. Various methods have been advocated, and some of them have been applied to a certain extent, to encourage the procreation which is alleged by the eugenists to be desirable. Educational methods have been used to disseminate knowledge with regard to the desirability of procreation on the part of certain individuals and classes. Certain economic methods of encouraging marriages in these classes have been proposed. It has been proposed to levy a tax upon the bachelors in these classes, thus furnishing them an incentive to marry. It has been proposed to pay bonuses upon the birth of children, or to grade incomes according to the size of the family, thus furnishing an incentive to procreate. More general economic methods which have been advocated have been those which would improve the economic status of these classes, thus making it more feasible for the individuals in these classes to marry and to have children. Under the head of positive eugenic measures have also been placed frequently measures which are directed towards promoting the well-being of parents and of children, both before and after birth. It is, however, evident that these are not eugenic measures in the strict sense of that term. While it is true that in the long run environment has much influence upon heredity, it is also true that inheritance takes place

directly through the germ cells, and only such characteristics are transmitted as are represented by determinants in the germ cell. Consequently only such measures as directly affect breeding, by preventing certain stocks from being perpetuated, and by encouraging the perpetuation of other stocks, can be called eugenic. If it were known how desirable variations in the germ cell could be induced, then measures directed towards this end might also be called eugenic. But our knowledge is not yet sufficient to enable us to do this. Measures for the betterment of the environment belong to euthenics rather than to eugenics. The classification of such measures under the head of eugenics is an indication of the tendency displayed by some eugenists to include too much under the head of eugenics. This has probably been due to an excessive enthusiasm on the part of these individuals for the science and art of eugenics. The term eugenic should be limited to measures directed towards improving the human breed, while the term euthenic should be applied to measures for the improvement of the environment.

§ 3—CRITICISMS OF PROPOSED EUGENIC MEASURES.

Let us now consider how desirable and how effective are the positive and negative eugenic measures which have been proposed, some of which have been applied to a certain extent. The first criticism to be made of most of these measures is

that we do not yet have sufficient biological knowledge to furnish a reliable basis for them. On the side of negative eugenics we have a certain amount of knowledge with regard to the inheritance of certain defects and of propensities to have certain diseases. Many of these are not sufficiently grave in their character to justify using repressive measures to prevent the individuals possessing them from reproducing themselves. But in the case of some of the more serious of these defects and propensities, it may be justifiable to use such measures. For example, in cases where there is reliable evidence that feeble-mindedness reappears again and again in a line of descent, thus showing that it is unquestionably due to hereditary traits, there may be adequate reason to prevent reproduction in that line of descent. The same may be true where there is similar evidence of the hereditary causation of epilepsy, insanity, syndactylism, etc. But the number of abnormal and pathological traits which it is as yet, on the basis of our present knowledge, safe to repress by such drastic means is still very limited. And in each of these cases it should be done only after ample scientific evidence has been secured of the hereditary character of the trait.

When it has been determined upon the basis of biological evidence that it is desirable to prevent an individual from procreating, the next question is to ascertain what method of prevention should be used. A considerable proportion of these individuals

are persons who should be segregated or placed under some form of restraint for reasons other than their unfitness for parenthood. Many of them are idiots, imbeciles, and low grade morons, who would be incapable of making their way in normal social life. Others are insane persons, epilectics, etc., who would be dangerous to themselves and to society at large if they were left entirely free. The restraint placed upon these persons for these reasons could also be made effective to prevent them from becoming parents.

But there are others whom it would be socially desirable to restrain from procreation, and yet there would be no other justification for placing any restraint upon them. In such cases it would be a grave injustice to these individuals to place them under any restraint which would limit their freedom in any matters apart from procreation. Consequently they should be made incapable of procreation without limiting their freedom in any other way. Castration is effective in destroying an individual's ability to reproduce. But this operation seriously affects the individual in other ways. It destroys the capacity for sexual intercourse as well, thus shutting the individual out from the normal sex relation. It also has far-reaching effects upon the temperament and character of the individual, which usually are not desirable. So that castration is not justifiable in the cases of these individuals, and probably is justified only for very abnormal persons, such as

idiots and low-grade imbeciles, upon whose characters it sometimes has a desirable effect.

It is, however, possible to sterilize by means of surgical operations which have no further effects. Vasectomy¹ for males and salpingectomy² for females have been entirely successful as operations of this nature, and there can be little question that these operations or better ones of the same nature, if such operations be discovered, should be used in the above cases. These operations would deprive these individuals of the right and privilege of parenthood, which is indeed deplorable so far as they are concerned, but which may be justified on social grounds. But such operations would not exclude them from the other human relations, and would not limit their freedom or change their status in society.

On the side of positive eugenics we have even less scientific data which would furnish us a basis for undertaking practical measures to encourage procreation on the part of certain individuals and groups. There is no doubt that there are great differences between individuals in their capacity for performing services which are useful to society. Certain individuals possess abilities which are rare, and which make these individuals very productive. Furthermore, there is much evidence that such abilities are in many of these cases inherited. So that it may appear desirable to encourage these individ-

¹ Removal of a portion of the vas deferens.

² Removal of a portion of the Fallopian tubes.

uals to reproduce themselves. Furthermore, it may appear desirable to encourage certain groups to reproduce themselves, because they are or appear to be more valuable to society than other groups. But our biological knowledge on these points is not sufficiently extensive or precise to furnish a basis for definite measures with respect to these matters. While we can see the individual differences and recognize the general fact of heredity, it is impossible for us to foresee with certainty the outcome of any particular crossing. So that it would be utterly impossible to regulate matings with any degree of wisdom, while there are other serious objections to such regulating which we will mention presently.

Many of the positive eugenic measures which have been proposed have been very foolish in their character. For example, it has been proposed that the incomes of civil service servants should be graded according to the size of their families. Those who advocate this scheme believe that it might in course of time be extended to all professions. In criticizing this proposed scheme it may be said, in the first place, that it is not certain that civil service employees, professional people, and other salaried groups are so superior to other groups that they should be given exceptional inducement to reproduce. In the next place, it is to be expected that if such a scheme is applied to any group it will encourage the mediocre persons in the group to reproduce rather than the superior ones, because the less

efficient will seize upon this method of increasing their incomes, probably to the detriment of their efficiency, while the more efficient will endeavor to increase their incomes through the excellence of their work. Thus the effect of any such scheme is almost certain to encourage reproduction of the mediocre rather than of the superior, and to diminish the incentive to efficiency for those who have most need for such incentive. The same objections hold against any system of bonuses to be paid upon the birth of children. A tax on bachelors may also be opposed on the same general ground, for like graded incomes and bonuses it bases income upon a consideration other than that of efficiency, and this is a very dangerous thing to do for obvious social reasons. The principle of remuneration without productiveness is already applied altogether too frequently in society, as in the case of the inheritors of wealth, idle wives, etc. No extension of this principle should be tolerated, but, on the contrary, every effort should be made to reduce these cases to a minimum, so that in course of time only those who are physically and mentally incapable of producing should be receiving any income without being productive.

In fact, it is doubtful if at present any positive eugenic measures are feasible, other than a certain amount of educational work in the way of disseminating knowledge with respect to heredity, the influence of environment, etc. And in this work the

greatest care should be taken that only well-ascertained facts shall be taught, and only the most cautious conclusions drawn from them. For the present, at any rate, human breeding will have to be left in the main to natural selection, and it is quite possible that this will always be largely true. Certain it is that the human species has so far survived, and has apparently in the main thrived under the process of natural selection. Had it not been for natural selection, the species would probably long ago have been swamped under the burden of a vast number of defectives. Indeed it is very probable that more important than eugenic measures is the elimination of certain dysgenic¹ forces, which have been developed in the course of the later stages of social evolution, and which are hampering natural selection from doing its work. A good example of such dysgenic forces is undiscriminating charity. In emphasizing the importance of natural selection, however, I do not mean to imply that it is the best form of selection which is conceivable, but merely that we have not yet and probably never will have sufficient knowledge to furnish the basis for a system of artificial selection which would be superior to natural selection. Certainly not until we know much better what is fit and unfit, both biologically and socially, should we attempt artificial selection.

The upshot of the above discussion is that the

¹ Relating to the detriment of the race.

only measure which society through governmental agencies is now justified in taking is to prevent a very small group, which is unquestionably unfit to reproduce, from procreating, and it is very doubtful if society can ever go much further than this for reasons which will be suggested presently, in addition to those which have already been stated. It is very doubtful if this group will ever exceed a very small percentage of the total population, let us say two per cent, and will probably be even smaller than this percentage. These considerations indicate the folly of many of the so-called "eugenic" legislations.

§ 4.—EUGENICS AND THE THEORY OF POPULATION.

I wish now to consider the theory of population. Eugenics is closely related to this theory because in the study of population it is very important to consider quantity as well as quality. But notwithstanding the importance of this relationship, it has usually been ignored by eugenists. We have much more knowledge on the basis of which to regulate the quantity of population than we have to regulate its quality. This knowledge has been derived from a study of the effects of the growth of population upon economic and social conditions. The results of such study we cannot discuss here at length. But it has been shown that the upper classes in many civilized states have the knowledge and the means by which to control births, and have used

them so as to reduce greatly the birth rate in those classes. Owing to the repressive and drastic legislation against the control of births, however, it is difficult for the lower classes to secure this knowledge and these means.

Now according to most, if not all, of the eugenists, the upper classes are those who should be encouraged to reproduce, while the lower classes should be discouraged from doing so. It should therefore be to their interest to remove the legislation which is directed against the control of births. For while the abolition of this restriction will not increase the birth rate of the upper classes, it will doubtless lower the birth rate of the lower classes somewhat. The result will then be to increase the proportion of those who are alleged to be eugenically more desirable. Thus to make the control of births free and easy would have a valuable negative eugenic effect in restricting somewhat the reproduction of the classes which are, eugenically speaking, less desirable, and would have a positive eugenic effect in increasing proportionally the size of the more desirable classes. Whether or not the eugenists are right in their estimate of the relative eugenic value of the upper and the lower classes, I will not attempt to say in this book.

§ 5.—EUGENIC MEASURES AND THE PREVENTION OF POVERTY.

Even though it is not possible, at present at any

rate, to do very much to improve the quality of the human stock by eugenic means, it is interesting and profitable to consider what would be the result if socially undesirable types could be eliminated entirely or in large part, and the quality of the human stock could be considerably improved. Many eugenists seem to think that this change would be sufficient to prevent poverty, but do not indicate clearly how it would do so. There are perhaps two or three ways in which this might conceivably happen, which we will consider briefly.

The first way is by means of a sort of utopia based solely on a perfected human character, in much the same way that the anarchists base their utopian anarchistic society upon human character as it is today. That is to say, the anarchists believe that the existing human character is good enough to make possible a society in which there would be no use of force, no formal organization, etc. The eugenist does not consider human character good enough at present to attain this end, but may think that when perfected by eugenic means men will cease to do each other any injury, will be efficient, and will work for the common good without the use of force, formal organization, etc., being necessary. It is evident, in the first place, that it is inconceivable that human nature could be changed to the extent that is contemplated by their theory of perfectibility. Such changes would bring into being an animal no longer human, or for that matter

mammalian, in its character, for it would involve the elimination of such fundamental human and mammalian instincts and emotions as anger, jealousy, fear, etc. But even if such a post-human animal did come into existence, it is difficult to believe that it could carry on the necessary economic activities without using a certain amount of formal organization, compulsion, etc.

The second way in which the eugenists may think that their eugenic program would prevent poverty is on the basis of the theory that the existing organization is effective enough to prevent poverty, but that the available supply of labor is so inefficient, because of its inherited traits, that the organization is unable to function properly, and so fails to prevent poverty. In other words, if the innate quality of the labor supply can be raised sufficiently to enable the organization to function properly, poverty would disappear without any further change being necessary.

This theory may seem to have a certain amount of plausibility. The enterprizer may assert that if labor were more efficient he could start new enterprises, or could expand his present ones, and in some instances his assertions may be true. It is certainly true that the unemployed tend to be the less efficient, as must, of course, be expected, since employers will naturally employ the more efficient rather than the less efficient of the laborers. But notwithstanding these considerations, it still remains

difficult to believe that the present organization of industry makes as effective a use of the existing labor supply as might be made of it. It happens all too frequently that efficient workmen are unable to secure employment, while even the inefficient should be given the opportunity to be as productive as they are capable. In fact, there is some reason to believe that the existing organization gives rise to a large idle labor reserve supply which must necessarily be in a state of poverty. So that it is hard to believe that the prevention of poverty is solely a matter of improving the quality of the labor supply. On the contrary, there is much reason to believe that it requires extensive changes in the organization of industry as well.

We shall devote more attention to the organization of industry in the course of the remainder of this volume. We shall also discuss the question as to the extent to which the quality of the labor supply can be improved by educational means.

CHAPTER VIII

PREVENTION OF POVERTY

We must distinguish between remedial and preventive measures against poverty. Remedial measures, as the term indicates, remedy somewhat the evils of poverty for those who are already poor. As a rule they do not lessen the amount of poverty, for they do not usually raise the poor to whom they are applied above the poverty line. The most that they ordinarily accomplish is to alleviate somewhat the misery caused by poverty. Preventive measures, on the contrary, are directed towards removing the original causes of poverty, and, consequently, are successful to the extent they lessen poverty.

§ I.—SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL MEASURES.

It is evident that remedial measures may be practiced to a considerable extent without any knowledge of the causes of poverty. But it is utterly impossible to apply preventive measures with any degree of success without an adequate comprehension of the causes of poverty. A philanthropist may observe the misery caused by poverty and readily discern how this misery may be alleviated without any knowledge of the causes of this poverty. But no one can do preventive work successfully without an extensive knowledge of the underlying causes and

conditions of poverty.

It is possible for measures against poverty to be both remedial and preventive in their character. Thus if remedial measures raise certain individuals above the poverty line, they may prevent poverty to the extent that it has been caused by the poverty of these individuals. But in many, perhaps most, cases remedial and preventive measures are distinct, and may indeed be opposed to each other, as when remedial measures stand in the way of preventive measures, or when preventive measures cause more misery temporarily.

Since these remedial measures cannot remove the fundamental causes of poverty, it becomes necessary to look elsewhere for effective preventive measures. In the course of our search we must consider as to what measures, if any, can have any material effect in preventing poverty, and if there is any ground for hoping that poverty can sometimes be entirely abolished. Let us consider first certain measures, which are frequently called preventive measures.

§ 2.—SOCIAL LEGISLATION.

The most prominent form in which the idea of prevention is manifesting itself at present is in the movement for what is ordinarily called social legislation. It is a little difficult to determine what is meant by social legislation as distinguished from other kinds of legislation. It is evident that most legislation is social in the sense that it affects all of

society. In our modern constitutional democracies there is comparatively little legislation which is openly and directly for the benefit of individuals and classes. But when we analyze what is ordinarily meant by the term social legislation by those who use it, we find that they apparently mean legislation in the interests of the poorer classes. This seems to be contrary to the democratic idea in modern government. But it is justified by its supporters on the ground that these classes are put at a disadvantage in the existing economic organization, and that therefore they should be aided by political means. Granting this, there is no objection which can be made against such legislation upon political grounds. But it still remains to be determined whether such legislation constitute an effective preventive measure against poverty.

It may be well, to begin with, to mention some of the more important forms of social legislation. A good deal of this legislation is called labor legislation. This is because it has to do with the conditions of the so-called working or laboring class. This is made up of the wage-earners, among whom most of the poor are to be found. This terminology is not entirely accurate, because it implies that the other classes in the community do not work, whereas it is well known that most of the members of these other classes work as much as the members of the working class. However, for purposes of convenience we shall follow the usual terminology.

Some of this social legislation regulates the physical conditions in factories and workshops with a view to conserving the health and safety of the employees. Such factory legislation includes regulations with respect to sanitary conditions, such as ventilation, suitable toilet facilities, etc.; overcrowding in the shops; dressing and rest rooms for the employees; protection against fire; and many other regulations of factory conditions. An important branch of labor legislation deals with child labor, with the object of preventing children below certain ages from working at all, and other children up to certain ages from working to such an extent as to interfere with their going to school. Such legislation sometimes prohibits those who are below certain ages from engaging in certain kinds of occupations which are harmful to the young either physically or morally. Other labor legislation regulates the labor of women with respect to the kinds of occupations they can enter, their hours of labor, the time of day when they can work, the periods during which they can work with relation to pregnancy and childbirth, and in many other ways. Child and woman labor legislation bring out very forcibly the peculiar character of social legislation, because these are classes of workers which are in special need of protection.

Another important branch of labor legislation for many decades past has been the regulation of the number of hours of labor. Such legislation is for the purpose of preventing the overworking of the workers,

and of giving them some time for recreation and cultural development. As a result of a good deal of legislation of this sort and of trade union activity, the general range of the hours of labor has fallen from twelve hours and more to ten hours and less, while a great struggle is now going on for a general eight hour day.

Perhaps the most important form of labor legislation has to do with the regulation of the rates of wages by means of minimum wage laws, etc. The legislation with respect to social insurance, workmen's compensation, and pensions is a form of social legislation which is attracting a great deal of attention at present. This kind of legislation also well illustrates the characteristic feature of social legislation, for it is directed toward giving special assistance to certain classes in the community.

There are various other forms of legislation which may be put under the head of social legislation. For example, most if not all of tenement house legislation may be called social legislation, because most of the dwellers in tenements are of the working class. This is especially true of tenement house legislation, when it regulates such matters as the kind of work which can be carried on in tenement houses.

§ 3.—THE UTILITY OF SOCIAL LEGISLATION.

It is evident that the important question for us is as to the extent to which social legislation prevents poverty. To begin with, we may note that the aim

of all such legislation obviously is desirable. It certainly is to be desired that conditions in factories should be sanitary; that children and women should not work when it is physically injurious to them (and the same should be true of men as well); that the hours of labor should not be too long; that wages should not fall below a certain minimum; etc. But the question is as to whether such legislation in the long run lessens poverty at all, or to any material extent.

At first sight it may appear that this must be true of all social legislation. For example, if workers are not subjected to insanitary conditions in factories, they are less likely to become diseased, and thus be prevented from earning a living; if children do not injure themselves by working at too early an age, and acquire more education, they will be more efficient workmen during their mature life; if the hours of labor are restricted, workmen are not so likely to become prematurely old through overwork; if wages cannot fall below a certain minimum, it may serve to keep a larger number above the poverty line. But social legislation may not have this direct result at all or may have it only to a very slight extent. In the second place, social legislation may indirectly serve as a hindrance to more effective preventive methods.

Let us illustrate, for example, with respect to child labor legislation. However desirable it may be to prevent the young from working below a certain age,

if it be true that when they reach the higher age, at which they are permitted to work, the opportunities for work are no more numerous, and the rate of wages is no higher than if they had started to work at an earlier age, it is obvious that they will be no better off and that the amount of poverty will not have been lessened. Now it is impossible to measure directly the effect of child labor legislation. But it is highly probable that this legislation has lessened poverty a little, principally because it has decreased the number of workers, thus increasing the number of jobs in proportion to the number of workmen. However, on the other hand it must be remembered that the incomes of some families have been lessened by such legislation, and that they have been brought closer to poverty. Furthermore, such legislation can have no effect in expanding industry so as to meet the demands of the labor supply for opportunities to work and to earn a living wage. So that at most the net result of child labor legislation cannot lessen poverty to any great extent.

The same may be true of all forms of social legislation. For example, it may appear as if minimum wage legislation must certainly be preventive of poverty, because if the minimum is set sufficiently high it will keep the workers above the poverty line. But, on the other hand, it is asserted by many critics of such legislation that it is bound to result in throwing many workers out of work, so that the net result might be an increase rather than a decrease

of poverty. However, it is quite likely that this form of social legislation will prove to be the most effective in preventing poverty, as we shall see when we discuss the subject presently.

It is therefore highly probable that most if not all of this social legislation can never accomplish very much in the way of preventing poverty. It is certain that such legislation is beneficial to individual members of the working class. But however much the members of the working class may be improved physically and mentally, so as to become more efficient workmen, it is doubtful if such an increase in efficiency is likely to lessen materially the amount of poverty without a corresponding change in the economic organization of society. So long as wealth is distributed according to the present method, and so long as industry does not expand adequately in response to an increase in the labor supply, it is not to be expected that poverty can decrease materially.

Furthermore, social legislation may stand in the way of more effective preventive methods. This may happen, in the first place, by distracting the attention of well-meaning people, who are sincerely desirous of lessening the amount of poverty, from more fundamental methods. It is true of a good many humanitarians today that they have realized the ineffectiveness of philanthropy, and think they have found sufficiently effective methods in social legislation. They think so because they exaggerate greatly the ultimate results from such legislation as

we have discussed. They are not yet capable of seeing the need for and the much greater results from such fundamental methods as those mentioned in the last paragraph.

In the second place, social legislation may be used as a concession and a sop, in order to avoid the application of more fundamental measures. We see often that capitalistic interests use philanthropy for this purpose. But when philanthropy no longer serves this purpose, it may become necessary for the capitalistic, aristocratic, or dynastic interests to make further concessions in the form of social legislation. It is doubtless true that much of the social legislation in Germany during the last few decades has been a sop to the working class, in order to induce them to desist from pressing their demands for more drastic socialistic measures.

But while social legislation cannot accomplish much directly towards the prevention of poverty, and may sometimes serve indirectly as a hindrance, it is nevertheless a necessary step towards more fundamental measures. This is so, if for no other reason, because many people have to be educated through social legislation to see the need for more fundamental measures. It is, however, desirable that the limitations of social legislation as a means for the prevention of poverty should be realized as soon as possible, in order to clear the way for more effective measures.

§ 4.—A NATIONAL MINIMUM.

It may be well at this point to speak of the idea of a national minimum, which has been crystallizing during recent years. This idea is that a minimum standard of working conditions, wages, and living conditions should be established for the poorer classes, and that no one should be forced or even permitted to fall below that standard. It is well to give this idea currency among the poor, and among those who are interested in their welfare. For as soon as it is generally believed that no one should live under conditions below this standard, efforts will be redoubled to bring into being a state of society in which no one will be forced to live below such a standard. Social progress consists in considerable part in the establishment of new and higher standards, and this should be true with respect to the standard of living of the poorer classes as with respect to other matters. As soon as such an idea of a minimum standard becomes prevalent, it will become powerful force for bringing this standard into existence in real life. Furthermore, this standard should, with the spread of civilization, become in course of time the minimum for the whole world.

§ 5.—PRVENTIVE MEASURES.

Having discussed the measures which are primarily and mainly remedial in their character, and only incidentally when at all preventive, we must now turn to the measures which are preventive of poverty

in a fundamental sense. As we have noted at the beginning of this chapter, preventive measures can be practised only on the basis of an extensive knowledge and an adequate comprehension of the causes and conditions of poverty.

Poverty is a social phenomenon which is closely identified with the organization and constitution of society as it exists at present, and as it has usually existed in the past. In order, therefore, to aid us in determining how poverty may be greatly diminished or abolished by preventive measures, it is desirable to make a brief survey of the present state of society, so as to determine what features of society as it now exist will in all probability have to be changed in order to bring about this reduction in the extent of poverty.

It is evident that to make such a survey is no easy matter, for the organization of society is a very complex thing, so that it is very difficult for the human mind, with its obvious limitations, to visualize it comprehensively. We may, however, succeed in doing so to a degree sufficient to enable us to discern more clearly the principal causes of poverty. We shall then be in a better position to consider how poverty may be prevented by removing these causes. We do not, however, hope to propose any complete program for the prevention of poverty. Indeed, we shall be doing well if we succeed in stating more or less effectively the problems involved.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the existing economic organization of society is that under the regime of private business enterprise the greater part of the means of production is owned by a comparatively small number of individuals, while the immediate control of most economic activities is in the hands of a still smaller number of individuals. The result is that most of the workers are put at a decided disadvantage in securing their share of the amount produced by society. Since the beginning of the modern industrial organization, and perhaps for a much longer period, the workers have not been able to influence to any great extent their share in the distribution of wealth. This has been determined by such factors as the richness of the natural resources, the density of the population, the accumulation of capital, the form of business enterprise, etc.; all of which are factors over which they have had little or no immediate control. In view of this fact it is not surprising that there is the great inequality in the distribution of wealth and the enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few.

Another significant feature of modern economic organization is the great instability of industry. The principal illustration of this instability is to be found in the alteration between the periods of depression and of prosperity which takes place in the trade cycle. But at all times there is more or less instability, since industrial concerns are failing, or

are overproducing and thus preparing to fail. The fundamental cause for this instability is the difficulty of obtaining an adjustment between the supply of and the demand for economic goods. Now it goes without saying that this difficulty has always existed, and always will exist to a certain extent. But in the past society was organized in the main in small communities which were more or less self-sufficient economically. Consequently producers were in close touch with the consumers of their products, and could adjust their output more or less accurately to the demand. Under the present large scale, machine system of production it takes a great deal of capital to start most industrial enterprises, and in many cases takes the producers a long time to discover the nature and extent of the demand for their goods. Consequently the chances for over-production and for business failure are greatly increased. The results are a vast amount of unemployment for the workers, and bankruptcy for many capitalists and enterprisers.

Another cause of poverty which should be prevented as far as possible is the waste of economic goods. Whether or not there is proportionately more waste now than there has been in the past, it would be difficult to determine. But it is not important for our purpose to decide this question. What is important is to determine the causes of waste, and to discuss how they may be removed. It is evident that the instability of industrymen-

tioned above causes a great deal of waste, through the loss of labor force and the dissipation of capital. A good deal is wasted through excessive luxury and extravagance in consumption. Advertising constitutes an enormous waste in modern society, while the middlemen and hangers-on of our industrial system cause still more waste. Many more forms of waste might be enumerated had we the space to do so.

The amount produced by society could be greatly increased if the efficiency of the workers were improved. By means of vocational training, scientific management, etc., workers could be distributed in industry more nearly in accordance with their natural aptitudes, and would be far more efficient because they would do their work by means of scientific methods. But to increase the efficiency of the worker is not sufficient if he is not given an opportunity to work. It would also be necessary to increase the opportunities for production, so that all of the human talent available could be used in the industrial system. Some of those who have written on this subject are of the opinion that with an increase in the efficiency of the workers would come automatically, so to speak, an increase in the opportunities for productive work. But this is a difficult problem to solve.

It is evident that the prevention of poverty involves fundamental problems both of the distribution and the production of wealth. This is well illustrat-

ed in the factors for poverty mentioned above. For example, the first factor mentioned, namely, the disadvantageous position of the worker, involves mainly a problem of distribution. The next three factors involve mainly problems of production, but also problems of distribution. For example, much of the excessive luxury and extravagant expenditure would be prevented if there were not the present great concentration in the ownership of wealth. There are various measures for changing the distribution of wealth so as to make it more equitable, such as co-partnership and profit sharing, co-operation, wage legislation, collective bargaining, price regulation, taxation, etc.; and there are also various methods of increasing the productiveness of society, such as the elimination of waste, steady business enterprise, stabilizing industry and workingmen's incomes, increasing the efficiency of the workmen, etc. These subjects, however, we cannot go into here.

CHAPTER IX

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

§ I.—NATURE AND PURPOSE OF DEMOCRACY.

Before taking up the movements towards industrial and social democracy, it may be well to discuss briefly the nature and purpose of democracy. To begin with, it has been shown at many points in this book, and is indeed a fact open to observation by every one, that human beings are not equal in their capacity for performing the biological, economic, political, and other functions which are essential for the preservation of the race and of organized society. For this reason, in any form of society the status, economically and otherwise, of the individuals constituting the society is bound to differ greatly. And in addition to being inevitable, these differences in status due to the diversity of human talent are in many ways desirable, in view of the great importance of an extensive and complex division of labor in any highly organized society.

But these differences in human talent do not preclude the possibility and certainly do not negate the desirability of equality of opportunity. That is to say, this diversity does not prevent the possibility of each individual having an opportunity equal to that of every one else to make the best use of his capacity, and to lead a normal human existence

as far as it is possible for him to do so. Equality of opportunity is, therefore, the first and foremost object and condition of democracy, and in a sense includes all the rest. And that this is of immediate significance for the prevention of poverty must be evident, when we consider that many of the poor would not be in poverty if they had the opportunity to produce what they are capable of producing, or could retain possession of what they do produce.

In the second place, we have to admit that any form of organization of society involves a certain amount of restriction upon the liberty of the individual. But such restriction is a necessary evil, which should be tolerated only to the extent that it is essential for the organization of society; because the attainment of the highest possible degree of personal liberty is one of the ends of democracy. This must be so, in the first place, in order to have the equality of opportunity which we have already postulated as the first end of democracy. For if the curtailment of liberty is carried further than is necessary, it means also the curtailment of the opportunities of the many as compared with the opportunities of the few in whose hands the power resides.

But this highest possible degree of liberty is also needed for another purpose of democracy, and that is the greatest possible development of the personality of each individual. Such development cannot come when the liberty of the individual is restricted to an excessive degree.

During the last century or two a great deal of freedom in the political field has been acquired in the form of democratic methods of government. Furthermore, it is supposed by many that a similar freedom exists in the economic field. In accordance with the doctrine of the *laissez faire* school it is asserted that the workman is free to take or leave work offered to him, and the capitalist and enterpriser are free to undertake business enterprises as they choose. But so far as the workman, at least, is concerned, this is a spurious form of freedom, for very frequently he must take the work offered him or starve. And the work offered usually makes him a slave, both physically and mentally, during most of his waking hours, for a very small recompense.

Consequently, under the conditions described above there cannot be any great degree of freedom or of democracy in the economic world. The problem therefore is as to how they may be introduced into industry. When this is accomplished, they will guarantee the right of every worker not only to a living wage, but also to sufficient income and leisure to permit of a full development of personality. This right will then correspond to the legal and political rights of the individual already recognized in every highly civilized country.

Let us see what forces are now at work to bring freedom and democracy into the industrial world.

§ 2.—PARTNERSHIP OF CAPITAL AND LABOR.

It is believed by some that it will be possible for capital and labor to form a sort of industrial partnership, as a result of which labor will secure its fair share of the product. Such is the idea which lies behind a few of the profit sharing and co-partnership schemes. We have seen that these schemes are feasible only in certain kinds of industries, and that when tried in these industries they are likely either to fail or to develop into co-operative organizations. The fundamental reason for this doubtless is that the interests of capital and of labor are irreconcilable at bottom under the present system. The capitalist is certain to continue trying to get as much as possible of the product in the form of profits, interest, and rent, and the laborer is certain to continue trying to get as large a share as possible in the form of wages. So that any attempt to form a partnership between them is in all probability doomed to failure, despite the assertions of some of the scientific managers that the interests of the two sides are identical.

We have also seen that the field of co-operative organizations today is limited, and that most of them are likely to fail. This does not mean that co-operation in the largest sense of the term is certain to fail. Some day the whole of industry may be organized upon a collectivist plan with a single comprehensive scheme of management. But this will be very different from isolated co-operative

organizations in an industrial world which is organized in the main upon a capitalistic basis. Furthermore, it is hardly conceivable that the whole industrial world could ever be organized as independent co-operative workshops and factories, as is proposed by some of the anarchists, communists, syndicalists, and others. The population of the world is too dense, the division of labor has been carried too far, and manufacturing and commercial processes are too complicated to permit of so simple a system.

So that, while the co-partnership and co-operative movement represent democratic tendencies, and therefore furnish some impetus towards industrial democracy and the spread of democratic ideas and ideals, they cannot be regarded as movements which unaided will bring into being any permanent and thoroughgoing system of industrial democracy.

§ 3.—THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT.

The most powerful influence today for industrial democracy probably is the trade union movement, frequently called the labor movement. It is important, however, to point out in what respects the trade union movement is a movement towards industrial democracy. In the first place, the unions are democratic organizations in which each member has a voice and a vote. This is the sense in which the Webbs primarily use the term industrial democracy in their masterly treatise on trade unionism.¹

¹ Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Industrial Democracy*, 1902.

In the second place, the unions have acquired a great deal of power over industry, so that they are able to dictate to the capitalists and enterprisers many of the conditions under which industry must be carried on. In this way the working class has secured a voice in the direction and management of industry. In the third place, the trade union movement may prove to be the first step towards an industrial democracy in the fullest sense of the term, in which industry will be owned and controlled by all of society. But it is well to bear in mind that the labor movement in general, as represented by most of its leaders, does not avowedly contemplate this end at the present time. On the contrary most of those engaged in the labor movement are endeavoring only to bring about certain changes in industry without trying to secure the permanent ownership and control of industry by the whole of society. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that this movement may prepare the way and lead ultimately to a thoroughgoing industrial democracy. We shall discuss this subject presently, when considering the future of the movement.

We have not the space to describe the history and organization of the trade unions, and in any case the facts are doubtless known to the readers of this book. But we must discuss the methods, the economic results, and the probable outcome of the movement, in their relations to industrial democracy.

The Webbs distinguish three fundamental trade union methods, namely, "the Method of Mutual Insurance, the Method of Collective Bargaining, and the Method of Legal Enactment." It is true, as the Webbs point out, that all trade union activities are in a sense forms of mutual insurance, since all of them are co-operative measures against low wages, excessive hours of labor, unsanitary conditions, unemployment, and all the other dangers which menace the workers in these trades. But, strictly speaking, the insurance includes only the friendly and out of work benefits supplied by some of the unions to their members. We have no space to go into the subject of trade union insurance at this point.

§ 4.—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

Collective bargaining has so far been the most important of the trade union methods. The need for this method is obvious. We know how helpless the laborer ordinarily is in bargaining with the employer. However "free" the contract is in the legal sense of the term, the advantage is usually on the side of the employer, because he can hold out longer than the laborer, and because there is usually an excessive labor supply causing a competition among the laborers which lowers their wages and injures the other conditions of their employment. The two principal objects for which the unions have used the method of collective bargain-

ing have been the standard rate of wages and a standard working day. That is to say, they have striven to fix minimum rates at which the members of their unions are to be paid either by the hour or by the piece, and a maximum number of hours of labor which if exceeded must be paid for at a higher rate of wages. The methods used to enforce their demands, when their bargaining with their employers has failed, have been the strike; various forms of the boycott, such as the union label, the black list, etc.; and other methods which are too well known to need description here.

In order to prevent the losses caused to the workmen, the employers, and the public at large, by some of the methods used by the unions, such as the strike, as well as by some of the methods used by employers against unions, such as the lock-out, many attempts have been made to avert the use of such methods by means of conciliation and arbitration. Some of these attempts have been made voluntarily by the workmen and the employers. In some places these measures for preventing industrial warfare have been legalized, and have been made compulsory. Conciliation and arbitration have frequently been successful, and probably will be used more and more to prevent the losses and injury caused by industrial warfare. But it is evident that the use of these measures does not lessen the fundamental antagonism between the interests of the workmen and their employers, and does not

ameliorate, except in a superficial manner, the bitterness of the struggle between the two hostile classes.

§ 5.—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF TRADE UNIONS.

The method of legal enactment has been used, at least to a slight extent, in every country where the labor movement has attained any degree of strength, while in some countries it has been used to a great extent. In some countries, as, for example, in America, the labor movement has not assumed a political aspect in the form of a political party. But in that country the labor organizations have brought a great deal of pressure to bear upon legislators in order to secure the sort of legislation which they have desired, and the same has been true in every other country where the situation has been similar. In many countries, however, the labor organizations have formed political parties, and have taken a direct and active part in political affairs. This has perhaps been most true in Australasian countries, where labor parties have been responsible for a large part of recent legislation.

The method of legal enactment is probably of more significance for the future than the other methods used by the trade unions, for it is possible that by means of a more extensive use of this method unions may take a prominent part in bringing into being an industrial democracy in the fullest and truest sense of that term. But before taking

up this subject it may be well to consider briefly the economic results from trade unionism.

§ 6.—CRITICISMS OF TRADE UNIONISM.

In the early stages of the labor movement it was customary to criticize it on the ground that it is not feasible to raise wages and better the condition of the working class by trade union methods. A number of economic arguments were used to prove the impracticability of trade unionism. One of these was the wage fund theory of wages. According to this theory the ratio at which the laboring class shares in the product is fixed at any one time, and cannot be changed by any effort on the part of the laborer himself. So that the only hope of increase for the laborer is through an increase in the total amount produced. But this theory has been abandoned by practically all economists, partly on theoretical grounds, but also because it has been disproved in practice; and this disproof has been furnished in part by the trade unions themselves.

Another economic argument against trade unionism was that it would discourage the accumulation of capital, because the capitalist could not get as high a rate of interest if a larger share of the total product was going to the laboring class in the form of wages. But it has been shown that in a good many cases a fall in the rate of interest has encouraged rather than discouraged the accumulation of

capital. One reason for this is that individuals who are accumulating capital in order to secure an income of a given amount are forced to acquire more capital in order to attain their end if the rate of interest is lower, than they would have to accumulate if it were higher. Furthermore, in many cases changes in the rate of interest do not affect the accumulation of capital, because the individual already has a larger income than he can spend; or because an enterpriser or capitalist accumulates for the sake of the power it gives him, and not in order to secure more wealth. It must also be borne in mind that even if an increase in the share of the product going to wages should lessen the private accumulation of capital to a degree which would be socially harmful, it might still be possible for the state, as representing organized society, to take measures for securing an adequate supply of capital. As a matter of fact, the tendency towards government ownership, which is now strong, would in all probability make this feasible.

A third economic argument used against trade unionism was that any improvement in the condition of the working class which might be accomplished by it could be only temporary, because it would immediately stimulate an increase in the size of the working-class which would at once nullify the benefits of trade unionism. It is true that in many cases this has been the immediate and temporary result. But we have already seen that a considera-

ble rise in the standard of living of the working class tends to lower the birth rate in that class, just as the same change in every other class tends to bring about the same result. And this will doubtless be all the more true as time goes by, and as the opposition to the artificial restriction of the birth rate disappears.

§ 7.—RESULTS FROM TRADE UNIONISM.

Let us now see what have been the actual economic results to the working class from trade unionism. In the first place, it is well known that many of the highly organized trades have secured high rates of wages, comparatively short hours of labor, and many other benefits from their unionism. In the case of these trades, unionism has had valuable economic results for their members. But practically all of these trades are highly skilled, and contain a comparatively small part of the whole of the working class. Furthermore, some of these trades have followed what appears to be a very selfish policy, namely, they have deliberately limited the number who could enter their trades, thus excluding others from the benefits to be derived from their unions and aiding themselves in maintaining a high rate of wages.

We have not the space here to discuss the reasonableness of this policy followed by these unions. But the above facts indicate that only the smaller part of the working class that belongs to the unions

benefit directly from trade unionism. And inasmuch as the vast majority of the poor belong to the class of the adult male unskilled laborers, female laborers, and child laborers, who are not organized at all or only to a very slight extent, it is an important question as to whether trade unionism has benefited at all or to any considerable extent the condition of this large class. It is obvious, however, that this is a very difficult question, and that it is impossible to give a definite answer to it. It is possible that by raising maximum rate of wages the trade unions may have influenced wages a little all along the line. On the other hand, it may be that the unions have had no effect whatever upon the wages of the unskilled laborers and the other laborers who are not organized.

At any rate, whatever the answer to this question may be, it is evident that measures should be taken to raise the rate of wages of this large class. This may be accomplished by means of legislation of various sorts, some of which have already been described. Or it may be accomplished by organizing these workers in some fashion. This is the main object of the recent syndicalist movement, which we cannot discuss here.

We shall now discern more clearly the status of trade unionism with respect to industrial democracy. Up to the present time this movement has not ordinarily contemplated any change in the fundamental economic organization of society. It has apparently

been resigned to a continuance of the struggle between the working class and the capitalists and enterprisers who are their employers. But it has endeavored to organize the working class or at least a part of it, so that the workers could get a larger share of the product. What the Webbs have said of its use of the method of collective bargaining has been true of the trade union movement as a whole : —“The workmen are frankly striving to get for themselves the best terms that can permanently be exacted from the employers. The employers, on the other hand, are endeavoring, in accordance with business principles, to buy their labor in the cheapest market. The issue is a trial of strength between the parties.”

However, I have already suggested a number of ways in which the trade union movement is at this time a force for industrial democracy, and it may become a much stronger force towards this end in the future. If, for example, the trade unions take an increasingly active part in political affairs, and the members of the unions become more and more imbued with collectivist ideas, the time may come when the trade union movement will become a decisive factor in bringing into existence some form of collectivism.

As to whether trade unionism would survive under collectivism, and would thus become an integral part of a thoroughgoing form of industrial democracy, it is impossible to say with certainty. In as much as

it has developed under capitalism, and arises out of the conflict of interests between capital and labor, it is doubtful if it would persist under collectivism. Trade unionism, however, is not merely an incident of the present phase of capitalist industry, and it seems to have a permanent function to fulfil in the democratic state as well. Should capitalism develop in the direction of gigantic Trusts, the organization of the manual workers in each industry will be the only effective bulwark against social oppression. If, on the other hand, there should be a revival of the small master system, the combined action of the workers will be more than ever needed to protect the community against industrial parasitism. And if democracy moves in the direction of superseding both the little profit-maker and the Trust, by the salaried officer of the Co-operative society, the Municipality, and the Government Department, Trade Unionism would remain equally necessary. For even under the most complete Collectivism, the directors of each particular industry would, as agents of the community of consumers, remain biassed in favor of cheapening production, and could, as brain workers, never be personally conscious of the conditions of the manual laborers. And though it may be assumed that the community as a whole would not deliberately oppress any section of its members, experience of all administration on a large scale, whether public or private, indicates how difficult it must always be, in any complicated organization, for an isolated in-

dividual sufferer to obtain redress against the malice, caprice, or simple heedlessness of his official superior. Even a whole class or grade of workers would find it practically impossible, without forming some sort of association of its own, to bring its special needs to the notice of public opinion, and press them effectively upon the Parliament of the nation. Moreover, without an organization of each grade or section of the producers, it would be difficult to ensure the special adaptation to their particular conditions of the National Minimum, or other embodiment of the Doctorine of a Living Wage, which the community would need to enforce; and it would be impossible to have that progressive and experimental pressing upward of the particular Common Rules of each class, upon which, as we have seen, the maximum productivity of the nation depends. In short, it is essential that each grade or section of producers should be at least so well organized that it can compel public opinion to listen to its claims, and so strongly combined that it could if need be, as a last resort against bureaucratic stupidity or official oppression, enforce its demands by a concerted abstention from work, against every authority short of a decision of the public tribunals, or a deliberate judgment of the Representative Assembly itself.

§ 8.—GOVERNMENTAL OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.

Another movement which may lead to some form

of industrial democracy is the movement toward the public ownership of certain kinds of industry. Ordinarily public ownership is advocated only for what are said to be public utilities, namely, certain commodities which are obviously used by all, such as water and light in cities, street railway transportation, postal facilities, etc. But it is evident that there is no hard and fast line between these commodities and many others which are quite as truly used by all. For example, the industries which produce food and clothing are public utilities in this sense quite as much as the industries mentioned above. So that a movement towards the public ownership of any industries may develop into a movement for the public ownership of all industries.

There is, to be sure, another criterion by means of which it may be determined which industries are suitable for public ownership and management, and which ones should remain under private ownership. This criterion is as to whether an industry can be most efficiently managed by the government or by private individuals. As to this question there is the greatest difference of opinion. Those with collectivist ideas and ideals naturally contend that public ownership and management is most efficient in most or all industries, while those opposed to collectivism contend that such management is most successful only in the case of very few industries. These critics of public ownership and management are able to cite many cases where such management has manifestly been

very bad. But it is doubtful if such cases furnish conclusive arguments against public ownership. Up to the present time governments have been notoriously inefficient. This has been due partly to the fact that the much greater rewards of private business enterprise have attracted many of the ablest men away from governmental work. It has also been due in part to the fact that it has frequently been to the interest of private business enterprise to corrupt government, and thus render it inefficient. It is probably true that governmental management of industry cannot have an entirely fair opportunity to demonstrate its efficiency except under a more or less thoroughgoing system of collectivism.

It is a well known fact that a great deal of governmental ownership and management of industry now exists. In some cases the industries are owned by cities, and in other cases they are owned by national governments. But it is evident that in each case they are owned by the public or by society as a whole, and that if the government is at all democratic such ownership and management constitutes a step towards industrial democracy. It is true that public ownership has not always been established for democratic reasons. In Australasian countries, where it is very prevalent, it has come largely through the influence and power of the labor parties. But in Germany, where also it is very prevalent, it was, directly at any rate, the result of a paternalistic form of government under the old régime. It should,

however, be remembered that a good deal of this public ownership in Old Germany was doubtless due to the pressure of the powerful socialist party upon the monarchical and oligarchical German government. Public ownership may also result from a struggle for national existence at a time of war. But whatever may be the causes for public ownership in specific instances, it is evident that if public ownership and operation should become almost or quite universal it would constitute a form of industrial democracy.

§ 9.—THE OUTLOOK FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY.

We have now described briefly the forces for industrial democracy. It would be foolish to attempt to prophesy what the outcome is to be. This much, however, seems quite clear, namely, that there are at least two forms of economic organization, one or the other of which may exist in the future. One of these is a capitalistic system of private business enterprise regulated and limited by several forces. One of these forces is the power of voluntary labor organizations using the methods of collective bargaining, and to a certain extent political action. Another force would be political regulation of various kinds, some of which we have discussed in this book. Such political regulation would come about through the power and influence of the laboring class, and of persons from other classes who for humanitarian or other reasons were desirous of putting a check upon the power of the capitalists and business enter-

prisers. Under such a regulated and limited capitalism poverty would probably be decreased much below its present extent, though as to whether it could be wiped out entirely it is difficult to say.

The other possible form of economic organization is some form of industrial democracy. Suggestions have already been made as to the form or forms such a democracy might take, and I will not speculate further on this point. Suffice it to say that no democracy is likely to succeed unless it affords ample opportunity for competition between individuals, and for rewards graded according to ability; and unless it makes possible a sufficient degree of concentration of authority to permit of the rigid discipline required for the efficiency to be attained only through the application of scientific method. However possible and desirable it may be to eliminate the sort of business competition which characterizes the present system, it is inconceivable that personal competition can be eliminated from democratic state in which, as we have seen, equality of opportunity must prevail. In the first place, it is hardly conceivable that such competition could be eliminated from any kind of a state. But even if it could be and were eliminated, this would be wholly inconsistent with the democratic ideal, for it would mean that an undemocratic method of determining the function of the individual in the democratic state would have to be adopted. As Cooley has said:— “There is but one alternative to competition as a

means of determining the place of the individual in the social system, and that is some form of *status*, some fixed, mechanical rule, usually a rule of inheritance, which decides the function of the individual without reference to his personal traits, and thus dispenses with any process of comparison."¹

With regard to poverty it is probable that it will be greatly diminished under any successful form of industrial democracy. For under such a régime industry would necessarily be conducted for the benefit of society as a whole, and not for the benefit of any particular individuals or classes. Consequently, one of the first accomplishments of a society organized upon such a basis would be the guaranteeing to every one of its members a minimum living condition which would doubtless be above what we now regard as the poverty line.

¹ Charles H. Cooley, *Personal Competition*, in *Economic Studies*, Vol. IV, No. 2, P. 80

昭和二年四月十日印刷
昭和二年四月十三日發行



(プロブレムズ)

定價金八拾錢

編 者 川邊喜三郎

發 行 者 中土義敬

東京市神田區錦町三丁目七番地

印 刷 所 研究社印 刷 所

東京市麹町區飯田町六丁目一一番地



發 行 所 北 星 堂 書 店

東京市神田區錦町三丁目七番地

振替口座東京一六〇二四番

電話神田一四二九・一三〇六

